

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

April 6, 2011

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, April 6, 2011, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Dr. Avrum Gotlieb (Chair)
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and
Provost
Ms Catherine J. Riggall, Vice-President,
Business Affairs
Professor Scott Mabury, Vice-Provost,
Academic Operations
Professor Philip H. Byer
Mr. Ken Davy
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard
Professor Christina E. Kramer
Dr. Jim Yuan Lai
Professor Henry Mann
Professor Douglas McDougall
Ms Natalie Melton
Ms Carole Moore
Ms Lynn Snowden
Mr. W. John Switzer

Non-voting Assessors:

Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative
Officer, University of Toronto Mississauga
Ms Kim McLean, Assistant Principal (Business
and Administration) and Chief
Administrative Officer, UTSC
Ms Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President,
Campus and Facilities Planning
Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning
and Budget

Secretariat:

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Secretary

Regrets:

Professor Parth Markand Bhatt
Professor Elizabeth Cowper
Professor Miriam Diamond
Mr. Shaun Datt
Professor Meric S. Gertler
Ms Lynn Snowden
Dr. Susan Rappolt

In Attendance:

Professor Franco Vaccarino, member, Governing Council
Mr. Andrew Arifuzzamam, Chief Strategy Officer, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Professor Tom Bessai, Director, Bachelor of Arts, Architectural Studies Program
Mr. Horatio Bot, Assistant Dean, John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Professor Richard Sommer, Dean, John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design
Mr. Fred Thwainy, President, Bachelor Arts, Architectural Studies Society
Professor Sandy Welsh, Acting Vice-Dean Teaching and Learning, Faculty of Arts and Science

ITEMS 4, 5, AND 6 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

Chair's Welcoming Remarks

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting (March 2, 2011)

Report Number 142 (March 2, 2011) was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

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

3. Senior Assessor's Report

Professor Misak provided an update on the provincial budget for 2011. Even though the budget had been delivered within the context of a fiscal deficit, education and health had received positive attention from the government. Professor Misak said that the enhancement for postsecondary education was the addition of 60,000 additional spaces in universities and colleges. With this in mind, the provincial government had set aside additional funding of \$64 million for 2011-12. This incremental funding was expected to increase to \$309 million by 2013-14. The University would request government approval for a number of additional spaces to meet the growth aspirations of the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). Growth was also expected in some of the professional faculties on the St. George campus. The deans would be engaged in the exercise to determine the growth in graduate spaces, both doctoral and masters, across the divisions.

Professor Misak continued her report with following highlights from the provincial budget:

- There had been a reaffirmation of the Open Ontario initiative with the goal of improving the process of transfer of credits between institutions.
- The government was committed to the creation of an online postsecondary institution. However, it remained unclear how this would be implemented.
- Postsecondary institutions were encouraged to increase their intake of international students, even though no additional funding would be provided from the government for this purpose. The University had its own academic reasons to continue its efforts to recruit international students.
- There had been no funds set aside for capital projects and the University would wait for further news from the provincial government on this matter.

Next, Professor Misak turned her attention to the provincial government's affirmation of the announcements made earlier with regard to pension reforms in the public sector. Institutions would be expected to meet the criteria set for the pension solvency test. In this context, it was expected that there would be an increase in the contribution from the active members of the pension plans.

3. Senior Assessor's Report (cont'd)

Concluding her report, Professor Misak recalled that education had been a major theme in the budget announced by the federal government prior to the dissolution of the parliament.

In the discussion that followed, Professor Misak reiterated that the plans for growth at the undergraduate level pertained mainly to UTM and UTSC. The increase in the number of spaces in doctoral programs would be much appreciated by some divisions. Professor Mabury added that the University would continue to be substantially selective with its growth aspirations.

4. Planning and Budget Committee: Revision to the Terms of Reference

Mr. Charpentier commented on the context of the proposal to amend the Committee's terms of reference. It came forward in parallel with proposals to make related changes to the terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Academic Board. The proposals at this time were somewhat different in that they had emerged from two parallel processes. First, the Task Force on Governance had over the past two years been engaged in a comprehensive review of the University's governance system. Its Report had been approved by the Governing Council in October 2010. At the same time as that review, there had been a Province-wide examination of the quality assurance process for both graduate and undergraduate programs.

Mr. Charpentier reported that the Task Force on Governance had heard, consistently and repeatedly, concerns about excessive duplication in governance, the substantial burden involved in securing approval of transactional matters, and the consequent need to streamline the consideration of items. In that context, the Task Force on Governance Implementation Committee had considered approval processes with a view to improving their efficiency while continuing to ensure appropriate governance oversight and accountability. As the Task Force developed its recommendations, it had met and consulted with the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs; the Vice-Provost, Graduate Education; and the Chair of the Committee on Academic Programs. The Task Force's objective had been to ensure it was fully informed about the changes being made to the quality assurance processes and to provide advice in relation to its own deliberations and expectations with respect to governance and oversight. The timely communications had ensured that the recommended changes were consistent with the intent of the Task Force in responding to concerns expressed throughout its work. Critically, the recommendations would result in academic decisions being made by the academic bodies within governance, including the divisional councils and the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. In particular, they would ensure that the highest level of academic oversight resided with the senior representative academic decision-making body: the Academic Board. It was necessary, because of provisions in the University of Toronto Act, that many of the Academic Board's decisions be confirmed by the Executive Committee of the Governing Council. However, that Committee's role was not to re-debate what the Academic Board had decided, but rather to assure itself that due process had been followed. If there was any serious concern, the Executive Committee would be able to refer the matter back to the Academic Board; it would not be able to reject an Academic Board decision. The Academic Board, and where appropriate the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, would be the decision-makers.

Mr. Charpentier said that along with the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, the Secretariat had been intimately involved in drafting the proposed revisions to the terms of reference and it was satisfied that they addressed the necessary responsibilities. As well, the Implementation Committee had reviewed and endorsed the proposals.

4. Planning and Budget Committee: Revision to the Terms of Reference (cont'd)

Under the revised terms of reference, the Committee would consider the budget implications for proposals for new academic programs only in cases (a) where their establishment would require the allocation of additional central resources to the division; or (b) where new programs would have effects outside of the division offering the plan –either on other University divisions or outside the University. The Committee would continue to consider recommendation to establish or close academic units.

The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had approved the revision to its terms of reference on April 5, 2011, to reflect these changes.

In the brief discussion that followed, a member sought clarity on the revised terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, as they affected the terms of reference of the Planning and Budget Committee with respect to the Committee's advice to the Academic Board on proposals to establish, disestablish or significantly restructure programs. Mr. Charpentier replied that the revised terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs would conform to the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP). The revised terms of reference for the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Planning and Budget Committee would be forwarded to the Academic Board for its consideration. It would be proposed that the terms of reference of the Academic Board be revised to conform to the new Quality Assurance Process. A member expressed his approval to the change with a view to streamlining the governance process. Mr. Charpentier reiterated that the Executive Committee would not assume more authority with respect to these proposed changes. The Executive Committee would refer matters back to the Academic Board for further review if it deemed it be necessary. The Implementation Committee was in discussions about other recommendation made by the Task Force, and further information would be provided at a later date.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed amendment to section 4.4.2 of the terms of reference of the Planning and Budget Committee be approved.

The documentation is attached as [Appendix "A"](#) to this report.

5. Proposal for the transfer of the Bachelor of Architectural Studies from the Faculty of Arts and Science to the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design

Ms Garner said that the proposal concerned the transfer of the Honours Bachelor of Arts, Architectural Studies program, from the Faculty of Arts and Science to the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design (FALD), effective September 1, 2012. After the transfer, the program would be offered as a direct entry program, with no changes to its curriculum or degree requirements; and, it would remain a liberal arts based program. The FALD currently provided the teaching and administrative support for the program. The transfer of the undergraduate program to the FALD would bring it in line with the common program offerings in place at peer competitor institutions within the province. Students currently enrolled in the program at the Faculty of Arts and Science would be offered the option of either continuing at that faculty or transferring to the FALD. All students enrolled in the program would continue to have access to courses offered through the Faculty of Arts and Science. The proposal had been the subject of extensive consultations at the program level with the students currently enrolled, and prospective students to the program within the Faculty of Arts and Science. The proposal had received unanimous approval at the Faculty of Arts and Science Council and at the FALD Faculty Council. Finally, there would be no new or additional financial resources required through the University's central budget to support the transfer of the program.

Among the matters that arose in questions and discussion were the following.

A member noted information on the requirements for students who, in future, wished to transfer into or out of the program. Professor Welsh replied that students wishing to transfer out to the Faculty of Arts and Science would have to meet the admission requirements for that Faculty. Similarly, any prospective students from the Faculty of Arts and Science who wished to transfer to the FALD would have to meet its admission requirements. Mr. Bot said that the transfer process remained identical to that for students registered at UTM or UTSC who wanted to transfer into the program.

A member cautioned that while current students had the flexibility to change from Architectural Studies to another program within the Faculty of Arts and Science, future students that enrolled into the Architectural Studies program would not have the option of doing so on request. The member hoped that this aspect of the proposed transfer would be recognized to allow the flow of students from FALD to the Faculty of Arts and Science. The member sought clarification that the option of a completing a second major at the Faculty of Arts and Science would be made available to future students admitted to the FALD. In response, Professor Welsh said that a large pool of current and prospective students had been canvassed about the proposed transfer of the program and that the response had been positive. Most students who enrolled into the program were aware of its requirements, and few had sought a transfer out of the program. Plans were in place to have a letter of intent that would allow students enrolled at the FALD to complete a second major at the Faculty of Arts and Science. The member said that this was a positive initiative.

Mr. Thwainy provided the student perspective and said that the process had been presented to the students in a transparent manner. Students enrolled in the Architectural Studies program felt that they had a greater sense of belonging with the FALD.

A member asked about the future of the current program that was being structurally delivered by FALD. In the opinion of the member, the Bachelor of Arts in Architectural Studies seemed an anomaly and antithetical to the direction in which the profession of architecture was headed. Professor Sommer concurred that undergraduate professional degrees in architecture had been phased out in Canada, and broadly in North America. The FALD expected the current program to grow. As was the case with similar programs offered at other universities in North America, the major in Architecture Studies could continue to provide a broad-based liberal arts education that could allow students to

5. Proposal for the transfer of the Bachelor of Architectural Studies from the Faculty of Arts and Science to the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design (cont'd)

continue on to programs in fields such as geography and planning. The program could be expanded if there was a demand to do so in future.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the transfer of the Honours Bachelor of Arts, Architecture Studies Major Program from the Faculty of Arts and Science to the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design, documentation is attached hereto as [Appendix "B"](#), be approved effective September 1, 2012.

6. Capital Project: 2011 Campus Master Plans

Professor Mabury and Ms Sisam made a detailed presentation on the 2011 Campus Master Plans. A copy of the power point presentation is appended to this report as [Appendix "C"](#).

In the discussion the following points were clarified:

- A member asked to what extent the Design Review Committee had been consulted with respect to the finalization of the Campus Master Plans. Another member who is also a member of the Design Review Committee explained that there had been very detailed discussions of the Master Plans by the Committee. The input that had been provided by the professional experts and lay members of Committee had provided much value. Each Master Plan was reviewed in a very comprehensive manner that had included varied perspectives of Committee members. In addition, several members of the Design Review Committee had had the opportunity to meet with members of the City of Toronto Design Review Panel when the Pan Am Aquatic Facility was being reviewed, and the member reported that City representatives were appreciative of the long range plans and vision that the University had put in place for its expansion. Finally, the member said that the significant increase in density, particularly at the St. George campus, with plans for taller and bigger buildings, paralleled the City's vision for the future. Additional density on the proposed development sites would allow the campus to meet its future space requirements without necessarily acquiring additional property beyond the campus boundaries. In sum, the member said that this had been an informed process and the Design Review Committee had a sense of ownership to the Plans. Ms Sisam added that there had been a series of discussions with the Liaison Committee of the City with respect to the Plans.
- A member noted that the planning principles identified in the Plans were of critical value to the projects. Would they result in a new planning policy? Professor Mabury responded that the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects* was under review and expected to be coming forward for consideration in the fall.
- In the opinion of a member, there appeared to be more emphasis on open spaces in the proposed Master plan for UTSC, compared with that for the St. George campus. Ms Sisam replied that the Master Plans being presented included information at a high level. The integration between built and open spaces would be considered when individual projects were being planned. There are no plans to reduce the amount of University open space on the St. George Campus.

6. Capital Project: 2011 Campus Master Plans (cont'd)

- A member asked whether there were plans in place for more integration of the Mississauga Transit system and the UTM campus. Mr. Donoghue replied that UTM would continue to work with Mississauga Transit to address the commuting challenges faced by its student body. The introduction of the U-Pass had been a success and similar initiatives would be sought.
- The Chair invited Professor Vaccarino to address the Committee. Professor Vaccarino said that UTSC was at a key juncture in defining its plans for the future. Enrolment was expected to increase, and the Master Plan for UTSC reflected that planned growth. Professor Vaccarino said that the integrated transit initiative would form an important aspect of UTSC's growth. In closing, Professor Vaccarino acknowledged the efforts of Mr. Arifuzzaman and Ms McLean in developing the Plan for UTSC.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

- (a) THAT the Campus Master Plan for the University of Toronto Mississauga be approved in principle to allow the University to negotiate municipal acceptance and municipal approvals.
- (b) THAT the Campus Master Plan for the St. George Campus be approved in principle to allow the University to negotiate municipal acceptance and municipal approvals.
- (c) THAT the Campus Master Plan for the University of Toronto at Scarborough be approved in principle to allow the University to negotiate municipal acceptance and municipal approvals.

The documentation is attached as [Appendix "D"](#) to this report.

7. Date of the Next Meeting – Wednesday, May 18, 2011

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Wednesday, May 18, 2011 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber.

8. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

April 19, 2011