

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**REPORT NUMBER 164 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**

**January 14, 2015**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on January 14, 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 Benjamin Alarie (Vice-Chair)  
Professor Cheryl Reghr, Vice-President and  
Provost  
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President,  
University Operations  
Professor Donald C. Ainslie  
Professor Suzanne Conklin Akbari  
Mr. David Norris Bowden  
Professor Eric Bredo  
Mr. Dylan Alexandre Chauvin-Smith  
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 Jim Lai  
Professor Amy Mullin

**Non-voting Assessor**

Mr. Malcolm Lawrie, Assistant Vice-  
President, University Planning  
Design and Construction  
Ms Christine Burke, Director, Campus  
and Facilities Planning  
Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief  
Administrative Officer, UTM

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Secretary, Planning  
and Budget Committee

**Regrets**

Ms Caitlin Campisi  
Professor Ron Levi  
Mr. John Paul Morgan  
Professor Lacro Pavel  
Professor Elizabeth Smyth

**In Attendance:**

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity  
Mr. Larry Alford, Chief Librarian, University of Toronto Libraries  
Mr. Tad Brown, Counsel, Business Affairs and Advancement, Division of University  
Advancement  
Ms Andrea Carter, Director, High Risk and *Accessibility for Ontario with Disabilities  
Act* (AODA) Office  
Ms Nora Gillespie, Senior Counsel, Office of the Vice-President and Provost  
Ms Daniella Mallinick, Director, Academic Program Planning and Quality Assurance,  
Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs  
Mr. Ben Poynton, Senior Coordinator, AODA Office  
Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant Provost

ITEMS 3, 4, 5, AND 11 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

ITEM 11 WAS CONSIDERED *IN CAMERA*.

### **1. Chair's Welcoming Remarks**

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting. He informed the Committee that Professor Ainslie and Professor Jacobs had been appointed to the Committee by the Academic Board.

### **2. Senior Assessor's Report**

Professor Regehr called on Professor Angela Hildyard to present the [\*Annual Report: The University of Toronto Ontario Disability Act Plan 2014-2015\*](#).

In her address, Professor Hildyard referred to the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act* (AODA) Report website and noted the following:

- All the standards legislated under the AODA were in place; and the University remained ahead of the schedule for the implementation of these standards and it would continue to do so.
- An audit of the implementation of the standards conducted by the Provincial government had recognized the University of Toronto as a leader of AODA standards among sister institutions.
- The recently-opened Toronto Pan Am Sports Centre (TPASC) with numerous accessible features and facilities provided a good example of the Accessible Built Environment standard in place. Under the Washroom Inclusivity Project, a number of upgrades continued to be made to washroom facilities across the University; these included hands-free faucets, baby change stations, and elevators.
- Under the Accessible Communications standard, many divisions had developed accessible websites using state-of-art technology.
- In 2013-2014, there had been a twenty per cent increase over the previous years in the in the number of students who had made use of the facilities and services offered by the accessibility offices at all three campuses.
- The University continued to develop initiatives to enhance accessibility for all users of lab facilities.
- The training sessions in place for staff and administrators on accessible course design had been well attended.
- The *University of Toronto Mental Health Report* highlighted the University's commitment to sustainable mental health initiatives and a systems approach in creating supportive and inclusive conditions for students to flourish.

In closing her remarks, Professor Hildyard noted that a strong commitment from across the University had enabled the institution to remain well ahead of the required legislative requirements. Several other projects to enhance accessibility continued to be developed.

### 3. Senior Assessor's Report (continued)

#### Discussion

- A member referred to the Back Campus fields and noted that a few accessibility concerns had been highlighted. Professor Mabury said that the University would work with Infrastructure Ontario to ensure that any deficiencies would be addressed in time for the usage of the facility for the 2015 Pan Am and Para Pan Am Games.

A member requested more detail about the initiatives in place to address student mental health issues. Professor Regehr referred to the *U of T Student Mental Health Report* (available at <http://mentalhealth.utoronto.ca/>) and highlighted some of the recommendations made in the *Report*:

- Increase general education for faculty and staff to create awareness of how they could be of assistance to students coping with mental health issues;
- Put in place or highlight existing preventative strategies for students experiencing mental stress and anxiety; and
- Enhance partnerships with hospitals that were able to provide services for students requiring greater assistance with mental health needs.

The Provostial Advisory Committee on Student Mental Health would continue to meet and advise on the implementation of mental health initiatives across the University.

A member highlighted the need for an increased number of private breast feeding stations across the St. George campus. The member also noted that the current location of the Accessibility Services office was in a building with only one elevator, while there had been two elevators at that office's previous location in a building on Huron Street. Professor Mabury noted that the current location of the Accessibility Services office on the St. George campus was an interim solution. In less than two years, the Accessibility Services offices would be located in a building with a number of elevators. On the issue of breast feeding stations, the Family Care office maintained a list of suitable sites across the campus. These sites would be highlighted in campus maps showing the various services available to students.

In closing several members highlighted the positive cultural change at the University in all matters related to accessibility. Members commended the institution for being a leader among its peer institutions. Professor Hildyard replied that the University community as a whole had taken responsibility for making the institution more accessible.

4. [Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Robarts Library Renewal and Expansion: Robarts Library Commons](#)

Ms Christine Burke presented an overview of the capital project for the Robarts Library Renewal and Expansion: Robarts Library Commons.

Mr. Larry Alford said that project would provide an additional 1,200 much-needed study spaces for undergraduate students on a 24/7 basis. Additionally, the space would allow for multi-purpose usage.

Discussion

- A member noted that the construction could have an impact on some dedicated trees on the lawns of the Robarts Library. Ms. Burke responded that the impact of the construction on some of the trees on the lawns of Robarts Library remained to be determined. The goal of the architects for the project would be, where possible, to preserve, replant, or replace these trees. The total project cost included the cost of replacing any trees that were lost during the construction of the Robarts Common.
- A member inquired about small group study areas the number of bicycle parking spaces. Ms. Burke responded that the floor plans for the Robarts Commons would be reviewed to include small group study spaces. There would a significant number of bicycle stands for the new facility in accordance with the city by-laws for such space.
- A member inquired if the computer lab space and the cafeteria facilities currently at the Robarts Library be made accessible to the users of the Robarts Commons, which was to be a 24/7 study space facility. Mr. Alford responded that the administration would continue to see how best the new space at the Robarts Commons could be managed. A bridge on the second floor of the proposed project could provide access from the Robarts Commons to some of the facilities currently in the Robarts Library.

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the *Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Robarts Library Renewal and Expansion: Robarts Library Commons*, dated December 10, 2014, be approved in principle; and

THAT the total project scope of approximately 5,614 gross square metres (gsm) to be funded by Capital Campaign , Provost's Central Funds, University of Toronto Libraries operating and capital funds, and/or financing (if required), be approved in principle.

#### 4. *Policy and Procedures for Faculty and Librarians on Academic Restructuring*

Professor Regehr said that the *Policy and Procedures for Faculty and Librarians on Academic Restructuring* was one of the elements of a tentative agreement reached through the Special Joint Advisory Committee (SJAC) process that had been undertaken between the University and the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA). The main issues that that the SJAC had set out to address were:

- Possible changes to appointment policies;
- Role of faculty and librarians in academic planning; and
- Review of the strengths, weaknesses and options for the modernization of the *Memorandum of Agreement between The Governing Council of the University of Toronto and University of Toronto Faculty Association (MOA)*.

The MOA had been approved in 1977 and had been amended from time to time. The MOA's basic structure and processes had served the University well over the course of more than three decades. The MOA supported the collective interests of faculty and librarians while providing for individual autonomy and flexibility in their scholarly and teaching pursuits.

Through the SJAC, the University had engaged in a consultation process on the tentative agreement with Principals, Deans, Academic Directors, and Chairs, and well as the Executive Committee of the Governing Council. UTFA had undertaken its own process of consultation with its membership. The UTFA Council had ratified the tentative agreement on December 15, 2014.

The key elements of the tentative agreement were:

- a. Changes to the MOA
  - Institute a new non-binding, facilitation and fact-finding process to address potential changes to the so-called 'frozen policies' in Article 2.
  - Revisions to Article 5 in order to clarify the statement on academic freedom.
  - Revisions to Article 6 in order to include sick leave, leaves of absence and parental leave benefits in the salary and benefit and workload process.
- b. Proposed Changes to the *Policies and Procedures on Academic Appointments (PPAA)*
  - Changes to tenure-stream faculty
  - Changes to teaching-stream faculty
- c. Introduction of a new policy – *Policy and Procedures for Faculty and Librarians on Academic Restructuring*.

Consistent with its terms of reference, the Academic Board would receive the proposed changes to the MOA and the PPAA at its meeting on January 29, 2015.

The proposed *Policy and Procedures for Faculty and Librarians on Academic Restructuring* provided a mechanism for the involvement of faculty members and librarians in academic restructuring.

4. ***Policy and Procedures for Faculty and Librarians on Academic Restructuring***  
(continued)

Discussion

A member noted that faculty could elect to opt into the new proposed changes with regard to the teaching-stream and tenure-stream and inquired if such flexibility would present operational challenges. Professor Regehr noted that currently, different and older policies were in effect for both the teaching and the tenure streams. The University would work with UTFA to address any issues that could arise. It was not uncommon for faculty appointments to be grandfathered into newer policies.

A member inquired about whether a current faculty hire who chose to move into the proposed new system would be of an equivalent rank. Professor Regehr explained that the University was working on the details that would result from the changes but assured that faculty who chose to move into the new system would move into an equivalent rank.

A member asked whether the *Policy and Procedures for Faculty and Librarians on Academic Restructuring* would have covered the recent changes to the graduate teaching programs at OISE. Professor Regehr responded that the proposed *Policy* addressed changes to academic units rather than programs and, hence, would not have covered the program changes at OISE.

On a motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed *Policy and Procedures for Faculty and Librarians on Academic Restructuring*, as outlined in the Vice-President & Provosts' memo dated January 9, 2015, be approved effective immediately.

5. **Guidelines on Divisional Academic Planning**

Professor Regehr said that the *Guidelines on Divisional Academic Planning* were the result of an extended and consultative process. In November 2010, then-Provost Professor Misak had announced the establishment of a Provostial Advisory Group on Academic Planning. The mandate of the Advisory Group was to “examine models of academic planning, and in consultation with the University of Toronto community, discuss best practices for planning at the unit and divisional level.” The Advisory Group had prepared draft recommendations on academic planning that had helped to inform the work of a number of Faculties and Divisions which had more recently developed academic plans. The draft *Guidelines* had been brought to governance for feedback in 2013. The development of the *Guidelines* had further been informed by the implementation of University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP). The *Guidelines* addressed the broader academic planning context and were being brought forward for approval in the same governance cycle as a tentative agreement between the University administration and UTFA.

## 5. Guidelines on Divisional Academic Planning (continued)

### Discussion

- Some members noted that the draft *Guidelines* had been useful for their respective divisions to establish their academic plans through a consultative and collegial process.
- Professor Regehr said that over the course of the work of the Provostial Advisory Group, a consensus was built regarding the content of the *Guidelines*. The *Guidelines* were now being brought forward for approval for the first time, as mandated by the revised terms of reference for the Planning and Budget Committee.
- A member recalled that the University had recently signed its *Strategic Management Agreement* (SMA) with the Provincial government. The member asked how the SMA coordinated with the *Guidelines*. Professor Regehr said that as a part of its annual budget review, the University had broadly engaged with divisions to establish academic priorities. These priorities had very broadly formed the basis of its SMA with Provincial government.
- A member asked how the *Guidelines* would allow for related units to comment on other units' plans. In response, Professor Regehr said that the external review of units was designed to include meetings with cognate unit leaders. Any academic change within a unit would require governance approval.

On a motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the *Guidelines on Divisional Academic Planning* be approved, effective immediately, as outlined in the memo by the Vice-President & Provost dated January 9, 2015.

### CONSENT AGENDA

On a motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

The Consent Agenda was adopted and that the items on it were approved.

## 6. [Annual Report: Approved Endowed and Limited Term Chairs, Professorships, Distinguished Scholars and Program Initiatives, 2013-2014](#)

The Committee received the *Annual Report: Approved Endowed and Limited Term Chairs, Professorships, Distinguished Scholars and Program Initiatives, 2013-2014* for information.

## 7. [Report of the Previous Meeting \(October 29, 2014\)](#)

Report Number 163 (October 29, 2014) 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. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting would be held on Wednesday, March 4, 2015, at 4:10 p.m.

**10. Other Business**

[Landmark Committee Project Planning Report](#)

Professor Mabury and Professor Ainslie provided a brief report for information on the Landmark Committee that was formed to make recommendations for the revitalization of King's College Circle/Front Campus, Sir Daniel Wilson Quadrangle, Hart House Circle and the Back Campus/Tower. Professor Mabury said that some of the themes that guided the Landmark Committee had included an improvement to the pedestrian experience; enhancement of green space; support events – specifically student events; the removal of surface parking from King's College Circle, Hart House Circle and; limiting traffic on King's College Circle and Hart House Circle. At the current stage of the project, the community would be invited to provide input on the revitalization project.

A member noted that it was her understanding that there was an expectation of the City Council that the University would establish a project liaison committee with a broad membership to monitor the impact of the Back Campus Project. Professor Mabury said that as a normal course of practice the University would continue to keep the neighbourhood communities involved about the impact of Back Campus field. Anecdotal information had suggested that the usage of the Back Campus field had increased for non-formal events as a result of the enhancements. It was expected that the usage would increase further after the 2015 Pan Am and Para Pan Am games when the facility would be returned back to the University.

***IN CAMERA SESSION***

**11. Capital Project: Report of the Project Planning Committee for the Robarts Library Renewal and Expansion: Robarts Library Commons – Sources of Funding and Total Project Cost**

On a motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Vice President, University Operations' recommendation, as outlined in the memorandum dated October 15, 2014, be approved.



The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

January 26, 2015