

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 170 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

January 13, 2016

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on January 13, 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 Ron Levi (Vice-Chair)
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-President and
Provost
Professor Cristina H. Amon
Professor Carol C. Chin
Mr. P.C. Choo
Professor Maria Cristina Cuervo
Ms. Linda Si Jie Gao
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning
and Budget
Professor Stephen R. Julian
Professor Lida M. Kohn
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President,
University Operations
Professor Tiff Macklem
Professor Elizabeth Smyth
Mr. Bruce Winter*
Professor Ning Yan

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Secretary, Planning
and Budget Committee

Ms Sheree Drummond, Acting Secretary of
the Governing Council

Regrets:

Professor Suzanne Conklin Akbari
Professor Heather S. Boon
Ms. Sandra Hudson
Professor Ernest W.N. Lam
Mr. Riaz Sayani-Mulji

* participated by teleconference

In Attendance:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Ms Andrea Carter, Director, High Risk and *Accessibility for Ontario with Disabilities Act*
(AODA) Office
Mr. Robert Cook, Chief information Officer
Ms Elizabeth Cragg, Director, Office of the Vice-President, University Operations
Mr. Marden Paul, Director Planning, Governance, Assessment and Communication, Office of
the Chief Information Officer
Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant Provost

ITEM 2 IS RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

OPEN SESSION

1. Senior Assessor's Report

i) Annual Report: The University of Toronto *Ontario Disability Act Plan 2015-2016*

Professor Regehr called on Professor Angela Hildyard to present the *Annual Report: The University of Toronto Ontario Disability Act Plan 2015-2016*.

In her address, Professor Hildyard referred to the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA)* Report website and noted the following highlights from 2015:

- The University had celebrated with the City of Toronto in successfully hosting the Pan Am and Parapan Am Games. The University had provided the venues and infrastructure, including the Toronto Pan Sports Centre (TPASC) at the University of Toronto Scarborough, for several Parapan Am events where the para-athletes had left a deep impact with their abilities.
- The celebrated track athlete, Ms Chantal Petitclerc, had been recognized by the University with an honorary degree and Ms Joanne Berdan had been honoured as the first para-athlete to be inducted into the University of Toronto Varsity Blues Hall of Fame.
- A team of undergraduate students from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering had won the Para-Sport prize at Council of Ontario Universities' (COU) Innovative Designs for Accessibility (IDeA). The team had developed "The Swivet", an innovative solution to assist wheelchair using sledge hockey players in transporting their equipment safely, independently and with little effort.
- The University had completed several projects in partnership with various organizations, including the COU, the National Educational Association of Disabled Students (NEADS) and the Council of University Libraries (OCUL). The University continued to provide leadership on AODA to sister institutions in Ontario.

Discussion

- A member asked about the proportion of buildings across the University that had yet to meet the AODA standards.

Professor Hildyard replied that the University continued to ensure that whenever possible, events were scheduled at venues that were accessible. It was not feasible to install elevators in some buildings and, hence, access to higher floors at such locations remained a challenge. Professor Mabury added that progress was being made to make the buildings across the campuses compliant to the requirements of the AODA standards. Like deferred maintenance, a committee prioritized the vital areas that required work to adhere to AODA standards.

- A member suggested that future AODA reports might more explicitly outline the University's progress towards meeting the AODA standards by 2025.

1. Senior Assessor's Report (contd.)

ii) Budget Process – An Overview

Professor Regehr and Ms Garner made detailed presentation on the process involved in the development of the Budget Report. Professor Regehr also provided [a report back on the University's Strategic Management Agreement \(SMA\) with the Provincial government](#). The presentations are appended to this [report](#).

Discussion

- A member noted that tuition fees were projected for a two-year period in the Budget Report and asked whether the tuition fees could be reassessed on an annual basis.

Professor Regehr said that the Business Board approved tuition fees on an annual basis only. Projected tuition fees for the following year were provided for information only and were, therefore subject to change.

- Several questions from members focused on the enrolment numbers for students. How was the complement of international students at each campus or division developed? Was there any scope for flexibility in such decisions and did the approvals inform each other?

Professor Regehr said that divisions brought forward their aspirational enrolment numbers based on their academic priorities. Several discussions followed about how divisions could support the students, the infrastructural needs, etc. In some cases, this iterative process involved a recalibration of enrolment numbers based on new information. Ultimately, 'Provostial approval' meant that the Provost agreed with the Dean on what came forward to governance for approval. The decisions for the distribution of allocated funds within each division rested entirely with the respective Dean for each division.

- A member asked how data informed the budget decision-making process – for example, regarding tuition fee increases. What analytics data was available to Deans to make planning decisions?

Professor Regehr noted that extensive data was available to inform decisions. On the domestic side, there was not much flexibility on tuition increases because of the Provincial government constraints. On the international side, if a division's proposed tuition fees increases seemed too aggressive, further analytics would be conducted and the data shared. The central administration constantly recommended back to divisions based on the division's performance and targets from previous years. More than half of the undergraduate students were eligible to receive funding through the Ontario Student Assistance Plan (OSAP). Any increase in student enrolment led to an increase in student aid allocations which impacted other areas of the budget.

1. Senior Assessor's Report (contd.)**ii) Budget Process – An Overview (contd.)**

- A member asked whether Governing Council had ever rejected the proposed Operating Budget Report. On what grounds would Governing Council find cause for such a rejection?

Professor Regehr replied that to her knowledge all Budget Reports had been approved by the Governing Council. The Budget Report was the product of a number of rigorous and well-considered processes. With each Budget Report, the governors had noted whether there had been a proper adherence to the processes that were in place. Any non-compliance with the processes could form the basis of the Budget Report being disapproved by the Governing Council or its bodies.

Professor Mabury added that the Budget Report presented annually was a projection for the following year. *Governance had confidence in the process, and the diligence of the administration to manage that process.* In the University's unicameral structure the responsibility for the budget and the budget guidelines firmly rested within the purview of the Academic Board. The Planning and Budget Committee was materially responsible for recommending the budget to the Academic Board. The principle behind all this was the 'primacy of the academic mission.' It was not typical at other universities for the primary responsibility for the budget to rest with an academic body (i.e., Senate-equivalent) and this was a unique strength of the University's system.

- A member asked what governors could do to limit the rate of the increase for domestic tuition fees. Was there a way for governors to impact tuition increases within governance?

Professor Regehr said the Business Board did approve the tuition fees and, therefore, in principle, could reject any proposed tuition fees increase and compel the administration to propose a revised tuition fee schedule. Government advocacy was another strategy to have impact on tuition. Professor Regehr referred to a recent media report and said that student groups such as the Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance (OUSA) continued to advocate to the Provincial government for an increase in resources to universities and a decrease in tuition fees.

- A member noted that the operating budget included revenues from financial returns – what was the impact of current low interests on this segment of the budget? Were reserves considered in the development of the budget allocations?

Professor Mabury replied that the Planning and Budget Office worked closely with the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Ms Sheila Brown, to analyze data and make reasoned projections on rolling 3 and 5-year averages. This process also involved a close examination of the reserves and contingency funds. Professor Regehr added that following the last financial crisis, there had been a year with zero endowment payout that had been managed by divisions through budget cuts and loans, among other means.

1. Senior Assessor's Report (contd.)**ii) Budget Process – An Overview (contd.)**

- A member referred to the Strategic Management Agreement and noted that a recent report released by the Provincial government had made reference to the use of metrics for the funding formula for universities. How much was known about the impact of the findings of the report?

Professor Regehr replied that that particular report by the Provincial government did not contain any specific details on metrics or about a new funding formula. It was anticipated that future actions following from the report would rely largely on the Strategic Management Agreements in place.

2. Policy on Information Security and the Protection of Digital Assets

Professor Mabury presented the highlights of the proposed *Policy on Information Security and the Protection of Digital Assets*. Professor Mabury focused on the broad consultative processes that had informed the proposed *Policy*. Professor Regehr noted that that it remained critically important for the University to have safeguards in place to protect administrative data and to ensure that personal data remained private. The central administration would assist divisions without the capacity to adopt the measures to protect their digital assets as required by the proposed *Policy*.

Discussion

- Expressing his support for the proposed *Policy* a member asked whether the University would develop minimum requirements and would divisions then have to come up with the appropriate plans to adhere to those requirements, and whether any minimum requirements had been finalized?

Professor Mabury said that a working group, co-chaired by Professor Ron Deibert, had already been put in place. The Faculty of Medicine and the Faculty of Law had data protection plans and these could serve as templates for other divisions to use. There would be a broad call for membership of the Information Security Council (ISC).

- A member asked where the accountability for adherence to the *Policy* would lie? Who would be accountable in a scenario where the means to adhere to the *Policy* were provided to a unit by the central administration?

Professor Mabury said that the President or designate along with the Chief Information Officer would be the ultimate accountable body. In the context of the central administration providing the services to a unit, of the 120 departments at the University, it was estimated that a majority would hire expertise from central administration to put in place the measures to appropriately protect their digital assets creating economies of scale and expertise in the cost of such services. The other units would develop their own plans in compliance with the *Policy*.

2. Policy on Information Security and the Protection of Digital Assets (contd.)

- A member noted that the financial implications in adopting the *Policy* were yet to be determined. How were those decisions going to be made and who would make them as this could potentially involve a significant expenditure?

Professor Mabury said that it would be dependent on where the plan was based and who was responsible for it in the executive. As an example, within the Faculty of Arts and Science if a department chose to implement a unit level plan, they would work with the Dean to include the resource planning in the divisional budget. If the department were provided with a plan and related services by the central information technology services, then it would be funded through the DAC process and the central shared service budgeting process. Once again, economies of scale could help in lowering the costs.

- A member asked whether the ISC would be responsible for the budgetary implications of its recommendations.

Professor Mabury replied that the core responsibility of the ISC would be to protect and advise on best practices. The ISC would not necessarily have the budgetary expertise among its membership; it would be up to the administration – through the President or the President’s designate – to accept and implement the ISC’s recommendations.

- A member enquired whether had there been any external review of the proposed *Policy* and its approach?

Professor Mabury said that on the recommendation by internal audit, the central information technology services had undergone a review. However, there had been no such external review of the proposed approach through the *Policy*. Professor Mabury expressed his confidence in the ISC whose membership would comprise of academics with renowned expertise in this area.

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed *Policy on Information Security and the Protection of Digital Assets*, dated December 21, 2015, be approved effective February 26, 2016.

CONSENT AGENDA

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

The consent agenda was adopted and that the items on it were approved.

3. Annual Report: Approved Endowed and Limited Term Chairs, Professorships, Distinguished Scholars and Program Initiatives, 2014-2015

4. Report of the Previous Meeting (October 28, 2015)

Report Number 169 (October 28, 2015) was approved.

5. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

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

6. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, March 2, 2016 at 4:10 p.m.

7. Other business

There were no items of other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

January 17, 2016