

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 177 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

May 10, 2017

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on May 10, 2017 at 4:10 p.m. in Room 202, Galbraith Building, at which the following were present:

Professor Steven J. Thorpe (In the Chair)
Mr. Bruce Winter (Vice-Chair)
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-President and
Provost
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-President,
University Operations
Mr. Harvey Botting
Mr. Edvard Bruun
Professor Joseph Desloges
Professor David Dubins
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning
and Budget
Professor Ira Jacobs

Professor Stephen R. Julian
Mr. Ben Liu
Mr. Jorge May
Professor James Stafford

Non-voting-Assessors:

Mr. Gilbert Delgado, Chief, Planning,
Design and Construction

Secretariat:

Mr. Patrick F. McNeill, Secretary

Regrets:

Professor Cristina H. Amon
Professor Maria Cristina Cuervo
Professor Luc De Nil
Professor Linda M. Kohn
Professor Tiff Macklem
Mr. Sean McGowan
Professor Njoki Wane

In Attendance:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak, Chair, Academic Board
Ms Judith Chadwick, Assistant Vice-President and Chief Administrative Officer
(CAO), Research Services
Mr. Nathan Doidge, CAO, Lawrence S. Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing
Ms Rosalyn Figov, Director, Operations and Finance, Office of the Vice-President
Human Resources and Equity
Professor Kelly Hannah-Moffat, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity
Professor Linda Johnston, Dean, Lawrence S. Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing
Dr. Daniella Mallinick, Director, Academic Programs, Planning and Quality
Assurance, Office of the Vice- Provost, Academic Programs
Mr. Ben Poynton, Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) Officer
Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant Provost
Professor Sandy Welsh, Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Carina Zhang, Vice-President University Affairs, University of Toronto Students' Union

ITEM 6 IS RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

OPEN SESSION

1. Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the last meeting in the 2016-17 academic year. He advised members that it was his last meeting as Chair.

Professor Thorpe expressed thanks to all members of the Committee and to the assessors and members of the Agenda Planning Group, including the current Vice-Chair and the former Vice-Chair, for their contributions. The Chair also acknowledged the support of the staff of the Office of the Vice-President University Operations, Provost's office and other administrative units, as well as the Secretariat.

2. Senior Assessors' Reports

Performance Indicators

Professor Regehr presented an [abridged version](#) of the *2016 Performance Indicators for Governance* report. She stated that the 2016 report, which provided an inventory of metrics that demonstrated the performance of the university, had been revised from the previous year's report. The full report now included an executive summary and more informative tables with 116 measures, 308 different indicators, and more than 3,400 data points. The indicators were organized into themes that paralleled new metrics contained in the Strategic Management Agreement (SMA) with the Province; and would be used for many purposes including evaluation, communication and reporting to government. A new website with interactive performance indicators and improved accessible versions of the report was being implemented.

Professor Regehr reported that the University's ranking position compared favourably with its international peers across all major global university rankings; when limited to only public institutions, it was among the top 10 globally. Its research was also one of the most highly cited in the world, 2nd only to Harvard, in all science fields – it was also a world leader in the volume of published research. The University continued to lead in successfully securing tri-agency federal research funding, with a 15.5% Canadian share; and led North American peers for the number of new research-based startup companies.

Professor Regehr provided additional highlights of the report: financial indicators included excellent credit ratings by bond rating agencies and continued success in raising gifts, donations and philanthropic research grants. Student financial support outweighed all other Canadian universities for a diversity of first-year entrants, many which were first generation. The indicators also presented areas for improvement including the need to address graduation rates of undergraduates.

In response to members' questions and comments, Professor Regehr explained that the University's ability to retain such high international standing compared to USA institutions with large endowment funds spoke to the University's strength of its faculty, staff and students given the metrics.

The Provost stated that the University would focus on three of the five metrics outlined in the the SMA, and in particular, research and education, which would differentiate the University's position compared to other Ontario post-secondary institutions; and impact the outcome of funding based on performance and weight of selected metrics. As a first step, the University would negotiate the type of performance indicators to be included in the SMA with the Province.

Update: SIF -LIFT Projects

Professor Mabury provided an update on the 48 Lab Innovation for Toronto (LIFT) projects which had been supported under the Federal government's Post-Secondary Institutions Strategic Investment Fund (SIF). Professor Mabury reminded the Committee that the projects were expected to be substantially completed by April 30, 2018 and that the total funding from SIF would cover up to half (50%) of the project's eligible costs (approximately \$190 million in total projects cost). The University had hired a SIF coordinator and developed a program dashboard tracking system which helped to identify risks associated with individual project costs, related schedules and scope. Professor Mabury stated that a year-out there was a good record of project management to keep all of the projects on-track. Some projects had been scaled back; others had significant project savings which would be reallocated to other LIFT projects which had experienced a project cost overrun.

In response to members' questions and comments, Professor Mabury stated that the original goal to access the total funding envelope under SIF would be retained. He was confident that risks would be mitigated and that the University would continue to report to the government as required under the program.

The Chair thanked Professors Regehr and Mabury for their reports.

3. Academic Plan: Lawrence S. Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing

The Provost stated the [academic plan](#) would provide guidance for the Faculty to reach its stated goals and objectives; the Plan also presented an outward-looking perspective for students, donors and others. The two-and-a-half-year planning process had engaged a wide range of internal and external stakeholders. The Plan was endorsed by the Faculty's Council on May 3, 2017.

Dean Johnston expressed thanks to the Office of the Provost for their guidance and support throughout the strategic planning process; and acknowledged the work of the Faculty's Chief Administrative Officer in preparing the document. She also noted the enthusiastic endorsement of the 2017-2022 Academic Plan by faculty and all stakeholders.

Discussion

Members commended the Dean and Faculty for a well-written plan which had included a process to measure progress and success – it would serve as a good example of an academic plan for other divisions.

The Chair thanked Dean Johnston and Mr. Doidge for attending.

4. Annual Report: Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA), 2016-17

Professor Hannah-Moffat outlined the University's progress towards meeting the AODA standards and moving beyond compliance to address accessibility barriers. In the spirit of the AODA, she confirmed the University's commitment to building an accessible working and learning environment for faculty, staff and students with disabilities across all three campuses.

In her comments, Professor Hannah-Moffat referred to the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) Report* and noted the following highlights from 2016:

- the Landmark Project had provided an opportunity through consultation with the Design Review Committee and members of the community in the initial proposed design of the project; this was a good example of accommodating best practices in the built environment;
- *Fostering Accessible Learning Environments: A Guide for Teaching Assistants* was made available to help improve accessible course and program delivery;
- Work under the mental health framework adopted in 2014 continued throughout the year; numerous initiatives were being supported (e.g. *Flourish* at UTSC) across the tri-campus to help address the increase in student mental health accommodation needs.

In response to Members' questions and comments, Professors Hannah-Moffat, Welsh and Mr. Poynton acknowledged the growing need to support mental health challenges on campus. In 2016, a working group co-chaired by the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs and Vice-Provost, Students was formed to identify procedures (i.e. revised academic change form) and best practices to respond early and quickly to accommodate students in cohort-based and lock-step programs. The group was engaged with academic and registrarial leads from all divisions that had cohort-based or lock-step academic programs.

A member commended the Vice-President and her team for the outstanding report of the key accomplishments underway and asked if there were plans to also report on the challenges and areas that required special attention. Professor Hannah-Moffat and Mr. Poynton confirmed that future reports, in addition to praising the good work undertaken, would also be a "plan-based" document produced to identify and respond to challenges; this would be the new approach going forward.

The Chair thanked Professors Hannah-Moffat and Welsh and Mr. Poynton for their report.

5. Design Review Committee (DRC): [Annual Report 2016](#)

Professor Mabury commented on the important work of the DRC and that its role was one of the critical elements to the life cycle of a new capital project.

Mr. Delgado stated that the DRC had discussed its terms of reference, which was informed by the review of the *Terms of Reference of the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*. He reported that one of the key conclusions was that the DRC felt that it required a better understanding of the surrounding context of each major project. As a result, the administration would present the overall campus master plan to the DRC to provide that

general context. Additionally, it would require that architects address the campus impact of all major projects as part of their presentation to the DRC.

Mr. Delgado presented an overview of the renovation projects, public spaces and campus plans, and new construction projects that had been reviewed by the DRC in 2016.

In response to a member's question regarding the status of the University's secondary plan with the city, Professor Mabury stated that the University continued to work with ratepayers to address long standing issues with respect to zoning, and in particular, applications for minor variances and the opportunity for citizen input. The new secondary plan looked to create "districts" (i.e. heritage district, open space district, etc.), as opposed to "address by address" zoning provisions within the physical boundary of the University.

Professor Regehr referred members to the May 5, 2017 Globe and Mail article on the One Spadina Project (John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design) which reported on the project's heritage preservation and contemporary design attributes.

The Chair thanked Professor Mabury and Mr. Delgado for their report.

6. Revisions: Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects

The Chair reported that under the Committee's *Terms of Reference*, it was responsible for recommending policy governing the approval of capital plans and projects to the Academic Board for its consideration.

Professor Scott Mabury stated that the review of the *Policy* was undertaken in light of the types and worth of capital projects across all three campuses over the past 4 years; and the challenges they presented. This had resulted in the proposed revisions regarding changes in the definition of "project scope" and threshold changes in "total project costs" (TPC); and the related governance paths for approval for Levels 1, 2 and 3 capital projects.

Mr. Delgado outlined the proposed revisions and provided examples of typical level 1, 2 and 3 projects. He explained that project budget increases were usually the result of unexpected conditions that increased the cost of a project; as such, they were often time critical. To expedite their approval, the administration proposed an increase in the Vice-President of University Operations' (VPUO) authority to approve changes up to 10% of the approved total project cost with a \$3M cap to a \$5M cap. It was also proposed that the VPUO be authorized to approve changes in scope within the approved project's original purpose, nature and intent.

Members sought clarification on the current experience of project costs and market thresholds compared to the past 5 years. Professor Mabury stated that the "type" of capital projects and related costs had changed; the University had undertaken 242 projects across the tri-campus. There was a desire to ensure that the appropriate governance approval processes were updated to reflect the University's experience of going back to market when changes were needed and as a result extra costs were incurred due to timing challenges. Professor Mabury stated that the University was also bound by requirements under the Provincial procurement policy.

The Chair thanked Professor Mabury and Mr. Delgado for providing the background to the proposed *Policy* revisions; and for the work by the administration at all three campuses.

On a motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the revised *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* be approved, to be effective June 28, 2017.

7. Revisions: *Guideline on Full Cost Recovery*

Ms Chadwick advised that the *Guidelines* were reviewed every five years and presented for information.

There were no questions by members.

8. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 176 (March 1, 2017) was approved.

9. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

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

10. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair stated that the first meeting of the 2017-18 academic term was scheduled for Tuesday, September 19, 2017.

11. Other Business

The Chair informed members that they would be sent a link by the Secretary for the annual evaluation survey. He encouraged members to complete the survey noting that the feedback was important on the planning of the future meetings of the Committee.

The Chair reported that Governing Council members of the Committee for 2017-18 would be considered for approval by the Governing Council at its meeting on May 18, 2017; non-Governing Council membership of the Committee for 2017-18 would be considered for approval by the Academic Board at its meeting on May 29, 2017. All members of the Committee for 2017-18 would receive information about the Committee, including a meeting schedule, during the summer.

The Chair extended best wishes for a safe and restful summer.

Recognition of Professor Steve Thorpe, Chair, Planning and Budget Committee

Professors Regehr and Mabury expressed appreciation to Professor Thorpe on behalf of the administration and thanked him for his dedication in Chairing the Committee since 2014. He was praised for his collegial approach and sense of purpose in the role of Chair; who encouraged participation by members and who was engaged in dialogue on numerous policy, budget and capital project planning issues.

Professor Sass-Kortsak, Chair of the Academic Board, on behalf of members of the Planning and Budget Committee, Academic Board and the Governing Council, thanked Professor Thorpe for his service to the Committee. Professor Thorpe had been a member of Governing Council since July 2012, and served as Vice-Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee from 2013-2014, and as its Chair since July 2014. He would continue to serve on Governing Council.

As a token of appreciation, Professor Sass-Kortsak presented a chair to Professor Steven J. Thorpe in recognition of exemplary service and leadership.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

May 11, 2017