



FOR INFORMATION

PUBLIC

OPEN SESSION

TO: Business Board

SPONSOR: Cheryl Regehr, Vice-President and Provost
CONTACT INFO: 416-978-2122, cheryl.regehr@utoronto.ca

PRESENTER: See Sponsor
CONTACT INFO:

DATE: January 22, 2020 for February 3, 2020

AGENDA ITEM: 8

ITEM IDENTIFICATION:

Update on the Tri-Campus Review

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

Under Section 4 of its Terms of Reference, the Planning & Budget Committee is responsible for “policy on planning”, as well as “guidelines for long-range planning and budgeting that are the basis for the development of the University's annual Operating Budget.”

Under Section 5 of its Terms of Reference, the Academic Board is responsible for “planning”, as well as “University objectives.”

GOVERNANCE PATH:

1. Planning & Budget Committee [for information] (January 9, 2020)
2. Committee on Academic Programs & Policy [for information] (January 14, 2020)
3. University Affairs Board [for information] (January 27, 2020)
4. UTSC Campus Council [for information] (January 28, 2020)
5. UTM Campus Council [for information] (January 29, 2020)
6. Academic Board [for information] (January 30, 2020)
7. **Business Board [for information] (February 3, 2020)**
8. Executive Committee [for information] (February 12, 2020)
9. Governing Council [information] (February 27, 2020)

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:

The University's [Tri-Campus Framework](#) was approved by governance in June 2002. The University's [Towards 2030 long-term planning framework](#) was approved by governance in

October 2008. And the [Towards 2030: View from 2012](#) review report was approved by governance in May 2012.

HIGHLIGHTS:

The University of Toronto has a unique tri-campus structure, bound together by a shared identity and a set of genuinely tri- or bi- campus graduate programs and departments. It is the product of a 40-year evolution, with the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses transforming themselves from small undergraduate colleges, to mid-size educational entities hosting a wide range of graduate and undergraduate offerings, and strong programs of research.

[Towards 2030](#) stated the University's long-term intent to create a regional "University of Toronto system," characterized by three campuses with increasingly strong individual campus identities. In light of ongoing evolution at the three campuses, as well as new opportunities and challenges in the tri-campus context, the President and Provost announced a review of tri-campus relationships in April 2018, under the theme identified in [Towards 2030](#), "One University, Three Campuses."

The Tri-Campus Review was guided by a steering committee and included five working groups, each with its own mandate:

1. [Academic Planning and Academic Change](#), which considered questions related to changing or creating new academic programs and units, as well as academic reviews and academic planning;
2. [Graduate Units](#), which considered questions related to graduate faculty memberships, faculty searches, the appointment of graduate chairs, and the structure of graduate units;
3. [Student Services](#), which considered questions related to tri-campus responsibilities in providing student services, modes of delivery for student services, and resourcing of student services;
4. [Administrative Structure](#), which considered questions related to tri-campus reporting lines and leadership; and
5. [Budget Relationships](#), which considered questions related to accounting for University-wide and campus-wide costs, the funding of tri-campus graduate units, and the annual budget review processes.

Each working group has been proceeding along different timelines, with all of them now close to completion. As of December-end, each working group has submitted final recommendations to the Tri-Campus Review Steering Committee, which will synthesize the recommendations into a final report that will be presented for information to governance at a later date.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no direct implications for the University's operating budget at this time.

RECOMMENDATION:

Item is presented for information.

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED:

- *Tri-Campus Briefing Note (May 2018)*

Tri-Campus Review 2018

Briefing Memo on Historical Documents

May 2018

This memo surveys University policies, procedures, memos, strategic plans, and other relevant documents to collect past statements, decisions and recommendations that could provide valuable context and background information for the Tri-Campus Review.

While the first section presents contextual data that will be helpful to all working groups, including the Steering Committee, subsequent sections move through the working groups in turn as follows:

- A. General Overview
- B. Academic Planning and Academic Change Working Group
- C. Graduate Units Working Group
- D. Student Services Working Group
- E. Administrative Structure Working Group
- F. Budget Relationships Working Group

A. General Overview

The five key documents in considering a review of tri-campus arrangements at the University of Toronto are:

1. [Tri-Campus Framework](#) (2002)
2. [Tri-Campus Letter of Understanding with UTFA](#) (2003)
3. [Towards 2030](#) (2008)
 - a. [Synthesis Report](#), Chapter 2 – “One University, Three Campuses”
 - b. [Long-term Planning Framework](#)
 - c. [Report of the Task Force on Institutional Organization](#)
4. [Report of the Task Force on Governance](#) (2010)
5. [Towards 2030: A View from 2012](#) (2012)

This section draws from these documents and select others to provide some historical context, as well as a summary of previously agreed-upon principles and practices regarding tri-campus arrangements at U of T.

Tri-Campus Framework (2002)

The *Tri-Campus Framework* (2002) sets out “principles to guide the design of a new academic administrative framework” for UTM and UTSC in anticipation of enrolment expansion across the University. The framework sought to balance two sets of tensions:

1. How to maintain and develop a distinct University identity, while recognizing that each campus is an integral part of the University as a whole; and

2. How to combine structural autonomy on each campus with formal mechanisms of horizontal coordination.

Towards 2030 (2008)

Chapter 2 of the *Towards 2030 Synthesis Report* (2008) is foundational to our current tri-campus arrangements and structure. Through extensive consultation, the report settled on principles of:

- streamlining and efficiency of administrative structure and services;
- a 'system' concept for a multi-campus university;
- a desire for a U of T model that on the one hand avoids duplication through the integration and 'interlocking' of graduate departments, yet on the other hand values and grows local expertise and strengths.

The *Synthesis Report* (pg. 17) also describes four constraints on solutions to the challenges of tri-campus administration, and especially on the possibility of evolving into separate universities:

1. Collective agreements and the difficulty of reorganizing existing staff complement;
2. Faculty collegial governance and growing graduate aspirations at UTM and UTSC;
3. Existing capital infrastructure that cannot be moved, and limited institutional resources to develop new, specialized infrastructure;
4. The St. George campus's longer history.

Chapter 2 ends with four principles about the University's tri-campus evolution (which seem to originate in the five principles on page 2 of *A Long-term Planning Framework*):

1. Collaboration must remain the norm wherever it makes academic sense;
2. Campus-level autonomy should not translate into wasteful duplication;
3. We must maintain and enhance the quality of education and research on each campus;
4. We must strengthen the broad identity of the University and not diffuse it through the aim of clarifying tri-campus arrangements.

Section 6 of the report of the *Task Force on Institutional Organization* describes considerations, deliberations and recommendations with respect to the tri-campus model. The key principle of "differentiation" of the campuses is highlighted throughout.

Past reviews have alluded to the challenges that tri-campus arrangements can pose with regard to government relations, international and industry partnerships, and research services, but have stopped short of grappling with these issues aside from recommending that central control in these areas continue. These challenges may require more detailed and direct consideration in the present review. The report of the *Task Force on Institutional Organization* in particular highlights the challenges experienced by UTM and UTSC with respect to government advocacy, be it gaining access to government grants allocated to universities as a whole but not to campuses of a university, or 'having a seat at the table' with COU and OCAV.

Appendix 1 of the *Task Force on Institutional Organization* report contains the consultation questions that were used to seek feedback from the University community, organized into four sections:

1. Academic relationships
2. Administrative relationships
3. Creating communities for students
4. Research institutions and industry partners

These consultation questions were formatted as a questionnaire and responses were solicited from student, staff, and faculty groups. Appendix 2 of the *Task Force on Institutional Organization* report contains the full list of individuals, groups, and areas invited to respond to the questionnaire. Both the questions and the list would be a good start in putting together consultation plans for the current review.

[Report of the Task Force on Governance \(2010\)](#)

The report of the *Task Force on Governance* (2010) highlights the need for streamlining tri-campus governance and distinguishing between business that could be considered locally at UTM and UTSC, and business that requires University-wide consideration. In particular, the report recommends the establishment of a Campus Affairs Committee to take over some of UAB's mandate when it comes to addressing local matters concerning student affairs and campus-specific services. The report does not explicitly address the Academic Affairs Committees at UTM and UTSC, although the creation of both sets of committees (under the Campus Councils) would eventually become a key part of the response to Task Force recommendations.

[Towards 2030: A View from 2012 \(2012\)](#)

In *The View from 2012*, the section titled "The Shape of our University" (pg. 33ff) addresses the tri-campus structure. The principle of differentiation and distinctiveness under a unitary University of Toronto banner remains in place, but three more principles are added to the four listed in *Towards 2030*:

1. "Academic excellence must be paramount" [to tri-campus decision-making].
2. "Research-stream graduate programs are organized on a tri-campus basis, which means that some inter-campus movement and collaboration is both inevitable and desirable."
3. "Faculty members and students are both part of a broader University and affiliated with a specific campus. As such, they should make efforts to strengthen that community even as they pursue their individual academic interests."

B. Academic Planning and Academic Change Working Group

Tri-Campus Framework (2002)

The *Tri-Campus Framework* (2002; pg. 4) lists the principles governing tri-campus academic planning processes, including the creation of formal joint committees of chairs of related departments by discipline, a Tri-Campus Decanal Committee for Arts & Science (“Tri-Campus Deans”), and the requirement of Provostial approval for academic plans and new academic units going through governance. The *Framework* also acknowledges that more than one Faculty or division might come to exist at UTM and/or UTSC over time.

The *Framework* imagines the Tri-Campus Deans, which would include the Deans of UTM and UTSC along with the Dean and Vice-Deans of FAS, as a key body for decision-making and coordination across campuses, especially with regard to graduate programs. Similar arrangements with other faculties are suggested should UTM and UTSC expand beyond one division. This Committee would be responsible for meeting regularly, developing planning directions across the three campuses, ensuring that consultation across related departments for academic planning purposes occurs (and for facilitating these discussions), and resolving issues that remain outstanding at the departmental level.

The *Framework* aspires to nurture a “nodal” distribution of strength, with specializations emerging at each of the campuses, including through the creation of new graduate departments offering doctoral-stream programs administered at UTM and UTSC. Pages 4-5 list principles governing academic programs at the graduate and undergraduate levels, including:

- Across U of T, there should be common standards across campuses for faculty hiring and promotion;
- Consultation among related disciplines/departments should take place on all three campuses with regard to academic planning and change (with the Tri-Campus Deans committee as facilitators);
- A University-wide governance committee (the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs) should ultimately consider all proposals for academic programs; proposals will not be brought forward by the Provost unless appropriate inter-divisional consultations have taken place;
- No new undergraduate programs should be developed without an identified graduate linkage;
- There should be no competing graduate programs (including professional master’s programs) in the same area of study.

Towards 2030 (2008)

Chapter 2 of the *Towards 2030 Synthesis Report* (pg. 19ff) discusses University-wide academic planning, especially with regard to the development of new graduate programs. U of T academic programs should “be nationally pre-eminent and internationally competitive,” with some programs examined for closure if they do not meet these standards.

The *Synthesis Report* acknowledges the aspirations of faculty at UTM and UTSC to expand their graduate activities at their home campuses, and thereby grow the research footprint at those campuses. While the report predicts the creation of new doctoral programs headquartered at UTM and UTSC, it notes

that such programs must still be offered on a tri-campus basis and must be open to qualified faculty from the three campuses.

Section 6 of the report of the *Task Force on Institutional Organization* describes considerations, deliberations, and recommendations with respect to the tri-campus model, including some principles regarding academic programs:

- A shared goal of fostering more relationships between first-entry divisions and UTM and UTSC, on the model of the Commerce program on the St. George campus;
- Unitary doctoral programs but specific program specializations headquartered on UTM and UTSC: “Each campus must be able to recruit outstanding doctoral students who can expect to fulfill their program requirements primarily on that campus.”
- The continued “facilitation of multidisciplinary and collaborative relationships across all three campuses” in order to recruit the best faculty members and administrative staff to the University overall.

[Towards 2030: A View from 2012 \(2012\)](#)

The View from 2012 confirms that “PhD departments and programs... are resolutely tri-campus” and that “a unitary doctoral level program may have areas of specialization that are located on different campuses and/or within different divisions” (p. 35). Internal documentation is available on two such situations: Management and Clinical Psychology.

Management

A Provost’s Office memo from 2005 outlines the tri-campus arrangement in Management, the next largest division with a significant tri-campus presence after FAS at the time of the *Tri-Campus Framework* in 2002. In 2005, the three campus-based departments offered undergraduate programs, and Management had a single Graduate Department of Management that offered graduate-level programming. Graduate program offerings continued to evolve over the next decade, and the Professional Graduate Programs Centre (2007), followed by the Institute for Management and Innovation (2013) at UTM, took on responsibilities for several professional master’s programs in management-related disciplines.

In 2014, a new MOU governing the (Tri-Campus) Graduate Department of Management (GDM) was developed. Under the 2014 MOU, “the GDM will coordinate and maintain academic oversight over all research-stream graduate programs in the management disciplines. Professional graduate programs will be administered and governed under the authority of the relevant campus units.” Also under the 2014 MOU, faculty members continue to hold budgetary appointments in campus-based academic units, with the participation of the GDM graduate chair required in search and tenure committees. In signing new appointment letters, the graduate chair, as indicated in the 2005 memo, “is assuring that the appointment meets standards for the University as a whole.”

The 2005 memo also outlines the processes for promotion to full GDM membership and for making, at the discretion of the Dean, additional non-budgetary cross-appointments to the Rotman School of Management, which is responsible for the professional master’s programs in management on the St. George campus. The 2014 MOU indicates that the GDM graduate chair is consulted in the annual assessment of members of the budgetary units in relation to their duties as members of the GDM for

the purposes of PTR, though final PTR assessments remain the responsibility of the Deans and Department Chairs of the budgetary units.

The 2014 MOU was eligible for review and renewal as of July 2017. The renewal process could reasonably consider the continued evolution of graduate program offerings on all three campuses, including the recent establishment of the Master's of Accounting and Finance at UTSC.

Clinical Psychology

The 2013 MOU between OISE and UTSC observes that there is a tri-campus graduate department of psychology, as well as an OISE graduate unit offering MA and PhD degree programs in applied psychology leading to registration with the College of Psychologists of Ontario. The MOU establishes “a tri-campus framework for Clinical Psychology” in order “to facilitate the independent and joint aspirations of the Psychology Programs at UTSC and OISE and to respect the University of Toronto’s principle of non-duplication of doctoral stream research graduate programs.”

Under this agreement, the MA and PhD programs in Counselling and Clinical Psychology are offered jointly by budgetary units at OISE and UTSC, which both have graduate unit status (the Department of Applied Psychology and Human Development at OISE and the Department of Psychology at UTSC/Graduate Department of Psychological Clinical Science). Within the PhD in Counselling and Clinical Psychology, there are two fields, one (Clinical and Counselling Psychology) offered by OISE and the other (Clinical Psychology) by UTSC. The MOU states that a single program director will chair a program committee composed of the program director and two coordinators and faculty members – one from each field. The committee addresses matters of joint concern, e.g., curriculum development, course content, admissions, course offerings. The program director is appointed by a Council of Deans, which is made up of the Deans of OISE and UTSC and the two graduate chairs. The MOU outlines provisions for academic change and admissions processes, resources, graduate faculty memberships, supervision, and accreditation, and is meant to remain in effect until the program is re-evaluated for accreditation. The OISE field has recently been re-accredited and the UTSC-based field has recently applied for accreditation.

C. Graduate Units Working Group

The 2003 *Letter of Understanding with UTFA* (para. 6) describes the aspirations for UTM and UTSC to develop more graduate-level academic activity, including graduate courses and graduate student presence. Moving beyond the topics addressed in the general summary, this working group will specifically address how graduate units might be administered in order to best meet those aspirations of graduate and intellectual activity.

The View from 2012 (pgs. 36-37) contains a good discussion of ideas to expand tri-campus graduate activity, such as empowering undergraduate student societies at UTSC and UTM to invite speakers, and holding practice job talks for graduate students at a campus other than their home campus. Challenges around transportation, especially to and from UTSC, were noted frequently during consultation, as were issues around the inconsistent delivery and use of technology across campuses.

Leadership of tri-campus graduate units

Leadership of tri-campus graduate units has been an issue for Arts & Science departments in thinking through graduate activity. The *Policy on Appointment of Academic Administrators* (2003) is one primary source document that will be helpful for this working group. See, for example, section 17, which states:

“It is expected that the Chair of a department may be the Graduate Chair, but that is not always the case. However, the Dean of a single-department Faculty may or may not choose to be Graduate Chair.¹ Where a Graduate Department covers more than one campus, this section provides the composition of the search committee.”

A series of memos from FAS sheds some light on the role of the graduate chair by discussing their selection and their secondment. The 2008 memo, titled '[Guidelines on the Graduate Chair in Arts & Science Graduate Units: The Role, Responsibilities and Appointment Procedures](#)', outlines the role of the graduate chair, which includes overseeing appointments and promotions to the graduate unit, academic planning, overseeing the management of graduate funding packages and coordinating TA appointments. While the role of graduate chair is “normally” filled by the chair of the FAS budgetary department (the “integrated chair model”), the PAAA envisions that the role of graduate chair and St. George budgetary department chair could be separated (“the separated chair model”), especially when the size and complexity of a unit warrants separating the roles, or when heavy activity in an area at UTM and UTSC makes it desirable. The decision to separate the roles of chair and graduate chair would require the presence of substantial graduate activity on at least two campuses.

A series of three CPAD memos from [2010](#), [2011](#), and [2017](#) discuss the process of inter-campus secondment for graduate administration, which allows faculty members from UTM or UTSC to assume a tri-campus graduate administration role. The 2010 memo followed a review of existing procedures, after

¹ This provision was put in place at a time when Deans of professional faculties were leaders in professional practice and professional education, but not necessarily in research and doctoral-stream education. Current decanal appointment practices are such that the SDF Dean is always also appointed as the graduate chair.

which changes were made to facilitate the process. The 2011 memo revises the 2010 process based on lessons learned following a year of implementation, making the following changes (among others):

- Requests for secondment must be approved in writing by campus Deans before a letter of appointment can be prepared;
- The faculty member's home chair should be consulted before the Deans are asked to approve a request;
- Secondments should be considered part-time, with the faculty member expected to spend the remaining time in teaching, research, and services activities on their home campus.

The 2017 memo reaffirms the process described above and announces intentions to review it again in 2020.

Graduate faculty appointment and membership

In addition to graduate chair selection, the Graduate Units Working Group will also likely consider issues of graduate faculty membership. The [Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments](#) (PPAA; 2015) outline policies for the appointment, promotion, and termination of various types of academic staff, including tenure-stream and tenured, teaching-stream, and CLTA appointments. The PPAA envisions close collaboration between FAS, SGS, UTM, and UTSC in all aspects of appointment policies, while allowing each campus "a significant degree of initiative in determining the patterns of faculty recruitment" (pg. 3).

The *Tri-Campus Framework* (2002; pgs. 7-8) and the 2003 *Tri-Campus Letter of Understanding with UTFA* outline the principles governing academic appointments, vesting more authority over faculty life-cycle processes with department Chairs, and mandating inclusive committees for hiring and promotion in order to more formally recognize "the importance of three-campus intellectual communities." The principles include:

- Campus-based primary appointments;
- A graduate appointment and graduate teaching/supervisory responsibilities for every tenure/tenure-stream faculty member;
- Representation of both campus and graduate (or other cross-appointment) unit chairs on search, tenure, and promotion committees for tenure- and teaching-stream; and
- Graduate (or other cross-appointment) chair input into campus-based PTR processes for tenure- and teaching-stream.

Finally, the June 13, 2017 revisions to the [Workload Policies and Procedures for Faculty and Librarians](#) (section 10) undertake to form a "Tricampus Joint Committee" to consider faculty workload matters in more detail.

D. Student Services Working Group

In the report of the *Task Force on Institutional Organization* (2012), the introductory section entitled “Creating Communities for Students” describes general principles to create a consistent undergraduate and graduate student experience across all campuses, with room for distinctiveness based on each campus’s strengths. Section 8 expands on that introduction with an articulation of five principles, seven strategies, and six recommendations in pursuit of the aforementioned goal:

Five principles:

- 1) “Just as the University of Toronto, as a whole, should be greater than the sum of its parts, a student’s total experience at the University should be greater than the individual components that create that experience.”
- 2) “Strategies to create communities for students should be expansive and diverse, reaching out to all undergraduate and graduate students – resident, commuter and international – and should acknowledge students’ perspectives, needs, interests and challenges.”
- 3) “Organizational structures and processes should support the development of academic communities for students at all levels.”
- 4) “The benefits of technology to build and sustain communities should be balanced against the experience and value of personal interactions.”
- 5) “Strategies to create communities for students should build upon existing innovation and should be advised by leading research and practice.”

Seven strategies:

- 1) “Greater opportunities for College membership should be provided for undergraduates in all first-entry programs.”
- 2) “The Task Force would support steps to increase faculty presence in the Colleges – for example through the provision of Offices on a permanent or “fixed-term” basis – so that students have an opportunity to meet informally with faculty from a range of disciplines.”
- 3) “We do recommend, however, that the University maintain a ‘watching brief’ on the desirability for increased residence capacity for graduate students as well as international students; also, the residence needs of UTM and UTSC deserve further analysis.”
- 4) “Leaders within the field of student learning, student development and instructional theory have focused on developing instructional methods that assume more active participation in their own learning and development by the students themselves... The Task Force would support the expansion of such programs to ensure that all first-year students have an opportunity to access these or equivalent programs. Once this is achieved, we would support expansion of these programs into the upper years, as appropriate.”
- 5) “The University should explore ways of creating an institutional spirit and culture within our diverse student body.”
- 6) “Several of our peer institutions are actively exploring ways of creating communities for doctoral students that extend beyond discipline boundaries. Examples include the provision of social and community spaces, access to child and family care supports, the availability of quiet space to reflect – a commodity often in short supply to those of our graduate students with family responsibilities and no access to a private office on a regular basis. The Task Force is very supportive of such initiatives.”

- 7) “The Task Force concurs that greater attention should be placed on developing optimal ways to communicate with the vast student body at the University.”

Six recommendations:

- 1) “The organizational structure of the University must enable and facilitate continued innovation regarding undergraduate, professional graduate and doctoral student engagement.”
- 2) “Distinct campus, college, faculty/division and student cultures should be balanced against increased collaboration and enhanced communication both within and across faculties/divisions as well as the university as a whole.”
- 3) “Adequate and suitable space to accommodate individual and group study, social events, faculty-student interaction external to the classroom, for undergraduate and graduate students, should be factored into the University’s space and facilities planning.”
- 4) “Where appropriate, alumni should be encouraged and welcomed to engage with students.”
- 5) “To facilitate the development of a greater sense of community, academic and non-academic events that bring together students of different levels of study and from different disciplines and programs should be encouraged.”
- 6) “The Federated and Constituent Colleges should be supported and encouraged to increase faculty and graduate student presence and to provide opportunities for College membership to St George campus students in all first entry programs.”

Funding student services

The View from 2012 (pg. 36) describes targeted University Fund allocations for student services at UTM and UTSC, as well as tri-campus initiatives such as IT upgrades to fill specific student needs when “disentangling central functions that are genuinely tri-campus from those that are campus-based.”

The [*MOA for a Long-Term Protocol on the Increase or Introduction of Compulsory Non-tuition Related Fees*](#) (1996) sets out the terms by which students will be involved in decisions to increase compulsory non-tuition-related fees or to introduce new ones. The MOA establishes the Council of Student Services (CSS) as a forum for the discussion of such issues, and its constitution is presented as Appendix A of the document. The objective of the CSS, which includes members drawn from both the administration and the student body, is to enhance the student experience by promoting the provision of the most efficient and effective student services possible.

At UTM, the Quality Services to Students (QSS) Council plays a similar role; its [terms of reference](#) are available online. The equivalent at UTSC is the [Council on Student Services \(CSS\) Committee](#).

E. Administrative Structures Working Group

The [Policy on Appointment of Academic Administrators](#) (2003) is the primary reference document for this working group. It envisions the potential for more than one academic division on each campus. Relevant provisions include the following:

- Section 48, paragraphs 2 and 3 outline the responsibilities and reporting lines for Principals and Deans at UTM and UTSC:
 - Principals are the “Divisional heads and Chief Executive Officers” for each campus. The Principal reports to the Provost for academic matters, and to the President for other duties (generally for campus management and external relations matters in their role as Vice-President).
 - Deans are the “academic Divisional heads of each College or Division within the College as may be created by the Governing Council”, and report to the Principal.
 - NOTE: In practice, UTM and UTSC Deans report dually to the Provost and the Principal. The Deans meet with the Provost monthly, while the Principals do not.
- Section 62(b) outlines the search committee composition for the campus Principals.
- Section 62(c) outlines the search committee composition for the Deans at UTM and UTSC.
- Section 83 outlines the search process for Vice-Principals of any college, including UTM and UTSC.

The [Policies for Librarians](#) (1991) do not contain specific provisions about the reporting lines for the lead librarians at UTM and UTSC. They also do not refer to the lead librarians at UTM and UTSC using the title “Chief Librarian.” Sections 64 and 65 are used to search for the lead librarians at UTM and UTSC, with the Chief Librarian for the University chairing the search and appointing the committee “in consultation with the relevant divisional academic administrator.” For example, for the recent search committee for the UTSC Chief Librarian, Larry Alford submitted the committee membership for Provostial approval following consultation with the UTSC Dean.

The most recent organizational chart for UTM, submitted as part of the self-study in 2015, has the Chief Librarian reporting directly to the Vice-President and Principal, rather than to the Dean. The most recent organizational chart at UTSC has the Chief Librarian, along with a range of other ancillary services (i.e., Centre for Teaching and Learning Services, A&S Co-op Office, Office of the Registrar, etc.) reporting to the Dean.

The *Tri-Campus Framework* (2002) acknowledges that more than one Faculty/division might come to exist at either UTM or UTSC, and that the position of Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean might have to be split so that more than one Dean reports to a single Vice-Principal (Academic) on each campus. This view is also reflected in the PAAA.

The *Framework* (pgs. 2-3) also articulates the principles governing the central administration of UTM and UTSC, and the establishment of a Tri-Campus Deans’ Committee. The formal membership of P&D and PDAD&C is described on page 4, and Figure 1 provides a diagram of reporting relationships that generally still hold. A more extensive discussion of these reporting relationships can also be found in Section 7 of the report of the *Task Force on Institutional Organization*.

The *Towards 2030 Synthesis Report* (ch. 2), the report of the *Task Force on Institutional Organization*, and *A Long-term Planning Framework* all agree about the continued need for a system-wide Provost to ensure “elements of coordination and quality control” with regard to University-wide academic planning, especially with regard to the development of new graduate programs.²

The *Long-term Planning Framework* contains more specific recommendations (pg. 7), but primarily focuses on how to organize the administrative structure of the St. George campus to better distinguish central administration from that of St. George. It is also noteworthy that the *Synthesis Report* generally focuses a great deal on the administrative organization of the multiple divisions on the St. George campus.

The *Towards 2030 Synthesis Report* cautions against “the pitfalls of ‘categorical thinking’ with rigid boundaries between campus-specific and University-wide mandates” (p. 69), offering examples like coordinated health sciences and a unitary School of Continuing Studies. It goes on to say, “It is feasible to imagine a situation in which various University-wide leadership roles are shared with site-specific officers across all three campuses.” The report encourages “piecemeal and incremental” changes with periodic reviews (like the current one).

² Though the report of the Task Force on Institutional Organization also proposes the creation of campus-specific provosts in addition to a system-wide provost.

F. Budget Relationships Pillar

Much of the tri-campus budget discussion in *Towards 2030* (2008) and *The View from 2012* focuses on prospective enrolment changes and the resulting revenue shifts, rather than addressing costs. Given that the enrolment questions seem to be somewhat settled with SMA2, the focus of this review may turn more to costs. For example, in the *Towards 2030 Synthesis Report* (pg. 20), there is discussion about the need for uncovering, analyzing, and then negotiating the true costs of doctoral-stream graduate education across the three campuses, with some faculty working on more than one campus in their various roles.

In *The View from 2012* (esp. pg. 52ff), there is discussion of the 'new' budget model, including costs and efficiencies of service. The *Towards 2030 Synthesis Report* (pg. 14ff) addressed tri-campus finances, noting that UTM and UTSC were "contributing a substantial percentage of their net revenues to the University's 'bottom line'" *The View from 2012* reported that base University Fund allocations had addressed the imbalance.