



**ENDORSEMENT AND
FORWARDING**

PUBLIC

CLOSED SESSION

TO: Executive Committee

SPONSOR: Jane Pepino, Vice-Chair, Governing Council

CONTACT INFO: governing.council@utoronto.ca (416-978-6576)

PRESENTER: See above

CONTACT INFO:

DATE: June 9, 2020 for June 16, 2020

AGENDA ITEM: 3(f)

ITEM IDENTIFICATION:

Report of the 2020 Committee to Review the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils (CRCC 2020)

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

The CRCC 2020 was established to conduct a follow-up review of the tri-campus model, further to the recommendation of the 2014 Committee to Review the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils. Specifically, the tasks of the CRCC 2020 were to: review particular elements of the tri-campus governance model which experience has shown may require some refinement, report its findings, and recommend refinements that would enhance the ability of the Campus Councils and their Committees to execute their respective mandates. The CRCC 2020 was mandated to report to Governing Council in June 2020.

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:

When the Governing Council approved the Terms of Reference for the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils and their Standing Committees in June 2012 the resolution included a provision which mandated a review of the new governance model at the end of its first year of operation. The Committee to Review the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils (“CRCC 2014”) reported its findings and recommendations to Governing Council on December 11, 2014.

The CRCC 2014 recommended a follow-up review of the tri-campus governance model in three years’ time, that is, in the 2017-2018 academic year. On October 12, 2017 following approval

by the Executive Committee¹, the timing of the review of the tri-campus governance was adjusted, further to the recommendation of the Presidential Review with regard to a review of the tri-campus administrative structure.²

At its February 27, 2020 meeting, the Governing Council approved the membership and mandate of the CRCC 2020.

GOVERNANCE PATH:

1. **Executive Committee [for endorsement and forwarding] (June 16, 2020)**
2. Governing Council [for approval in principle] (June 25, 2020)

HIGHLIGHTS:

The CRCC 2020's recommendations include proposals for consideration by Governing Council in three general areas – budget, leadership and membership. Further to these recommendations, the CRCC 2020 also proposes revisions to the Terms of Reference of the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils and their Standing Committees to align with current governance practices across all campuses. Following the governance process, this proposed redrafting of the Terms will follow at a later date (to be recommended to Governing Council for approval), once they have been fully considered by the governance bodies to whom they relate.

Recommendations to Governing Council:

(a) Budget

Building on the recommendations of the administrative Tri-Campus Review undertaken by the Vice-President and Provost, wherein there was recognition of the need for UTM and UTSC to have greater autonomy and control over their annual budgeting processes, such that the local community might be engaged more fully as the campus budgets are developed for roll-up into the University operating budget, the CRCC 2020 recommends changing the governance pathway for the campus operating budgets. Specifically, the CRCC 2020 recommends:

- i. reducing the number of presentations on the campus operating budget, by eliminating the Cycle 1 presentation on the campus operating budget to CAC and CC, and introducing a status report on respective campus strategic

¹ Report Number 491 of the Executive Committee, October 12, 2017.

² The December 2014 Report of the Committee to Review the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils recommended that a review of the tri-campus governance model take place in the 2017-18 academic year. The Presidential Review Report had noted that the review of the tri-campus administrative structure should precede the review of the tri-campus governance model and as such the timing of the governance review should be adjusted as needed.

priorities by the UTM and UTSC senior administration to CAC and CC in Cycle 2;

- ii. including a presentation to the respective campus governance bodies on the comprehensive institutional operating budget, for information, as part of the existing Cycle 4 presentations by the Vice-President and Provost;
- iii. introducing a campus operating budget presentation by the respective Vice-President and Principal and Chief Administrative Officer of each campus, for information, in Cycle 5.

(b) Leadership

The CRCC 2020 recommends that the process for the appointment of leadership of the Campus Councils mirror that of the Boards whereby the Chair recommends the appointments to the Governing Council for approval. The Chair's recommendations are informed, as appropriate, by governors' nominations, governors' preferences, and having regard to needs and skills sets.

(c) Membership

The CRCC 2020 recommends that the full-time and part-time undergraduate constituencies be combined with no change to the total number of student seats. This would allow for fungibility across these constituencies to ensure that all undergraduate seats are filled.

The recommendation for greater flexibility in the distribution of seats across the various student estates is aimed at supporting a stronger (collective) student voice to help ensure that every student seat is filled.

The Committee recognizes the ongoing need for efforts to raise awareness of governance, its importance, the opportunities for engagement, and the value and benefits of participation. In that regard, we also encourage Chairs, Vice-Chairs, Assessors, the Secretariat, and members to continue to identify and recruit interested prospective governance members.

Recommendations to Enhance Current Practice:

The past seven years of governance experience has shown that the Terms of Reference of the Campus Councils and the Standing Committees may require some minor refinements. Those refinements coalesce around the main themes of membership, leadership appointments, and areas of responsibility of the respective bodies.

When the revisions to the various Terms of References, further to the recommendations of this Report, are considered, the Committee suggests that this would also be the appropriate opportunity for the Campus Councils to consider any additional minor refinements for the enhancement of current practice as needed.

It was also noted that the expectation is that the UTM and the UTSC Campus Council Chairs report at the Executive Committee and the Governing Council on the items coming forward to those bodies from the Campus Councils for confirmation or for approval. On occasion, however, when the matter was one that was also considered by one of the Boards, this practice has been inadvertently overlooked. It is vital that the relevant Campus Council Chair always reports on items that originate from the respective Campus, regardless of whether the matter has also received consideration by a Board.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

n/a

RECOMMENDATION:

Be it Resolved

THAT the Executive Committee endorse and forward the following recommendation to the Governing Council:

THAT the Report of the 2020 Committee to Review the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils, dated June 5, 2020, be approved in principle.

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED:

Report of the Committee to Review the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils (June 5, 2020)



UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

**REPORT OF THE 2020 COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE UTM AND
UTSC CAMPUS COUNCILS (CRCC 2020)**

**Approved by the CRCC June 5, 2020
Approved for Endorsement and Forwarding to Governing Council
by Executive Committee June 16, 2020**

CONTENTS

Summary: 3

Background: 4

Committee to Review the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils (CRCC, 2020): 6

 Composition of the CRCC 2020: 7

 CRCC 2020 Work Plan: 7

CRCC 2020 Findings: 9

 Consideration of Budget-Related Matters: 9

 Leadership: 10

 Membership: 11

 Additional Refinements: 12

Recommendations: 13

COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE UTM AND UTSC CAMPUS COUNCILS

DRAFT REPORT

The Committee to Review the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils (CRCC 2020) was mandated to review particular elements of the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils which experience has shown may require some refinement and to report its findings and recommendations to Governing Council in June 2020. The following report and recommendations of the CRCC 2020 are the result of work undertaken by the Committee during the period March to June 2020.

SUMMARY:

The Committee's recommendations include proposals for consideration by Governing Council in three general areas – budget, leadership and membership. Further to these recommendations, the CRCC 2020 also proposes revisions to the Terms of Reference of the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils and their Standing Committees to align with current governance practices across all campuses. Following the governance process, this proposed redrafting of the Terms will follow at a later date (to be recommended to Governing Council for approval), once they have been fully considered by the governance bodies to whom they relate.

BACKGROUND:

Overview of the Role and Membership of the Campus Councils and their Standing Committees

On behalf of Governing Council, with responsibilities delegated to them by the Governing Council, the **Campus Councils** (CCs) exercise governance oversight of campus-specific matters arising from their Standing Committees (the Academic Affairs Committees, the Campus Affairs Committees, and the Agenda Committees), as well as any other matters assigned to them by Governing Council. The Campus Councils are comparable to the Boards of the Governing Council and, as such, comprise representatives of the five estates: administrative staff, alumni, students, teaching staff, and Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council appointees or members of the external community.

Responsible for academic matters, the **Academic Affairs Committees** (AACs) reflect the structure of the Academic Board and the former faculty councils and their academic sub-committees. Essentially, the AACs replace the academic program and regulatory functions of the former Faculty Councils (i.e., the Council of the University of Toronto Scarborough, and the University of Toronto Mississauga Council). The AACs are relatively large bodies, with membership mirroring the distribution of estates on the Academic Board and which is intended to ensure a majority representation for teaching staff. While there are a few areas of business which may be recommended to the CCs for approval, the vast majority of proposals brought to the AACs either have final approval at the Committees themselves (as was formerly the case with the Faculty Councils), or would be recommended for approval directly to other bodies of the Governing Council (such as the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs) without being considered by the CCs.

In respect of the UTM and UTSC campuses, the **Campus Affairs Committees** (CACs) have taken on many of the responsibilities related to business previously brought forward to the University Affairs Board (UAB) and the Planning and Budget Committee (PB). The CACs include approximately two dozen members and, consistent with the composition of UAB and PB, the majority of members are drawn from the internal campus community. Some matters brought forward to the CACs are recommended for approval to the CCs (subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee). Other proposals are then recommended by the CCs to the Boards and then possibly the Governing Council itself.

The **Agenda Committees** (ACs) are smaller bodies and, in addition to having a formal agenda setting role for meetings of the CCs, serve, in slightly expanded form, as the Nominating Committees for community members on the CCs.

For an authoritative and detailed list of the responsibilities of each of the bodies, refer to the Terms of Reference of the UTM Campus Council and the UTSC Campus Council¹.

¹ <https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/governance-bodies>

Relationship Between Campus and Institutional Governance Bodies

The governance bodies at UTM and UTSC are not intended to mirror the instructional governance bodies. As noted above, they have delegated responsibilities with regard to campus-specific matters. There is an intentional asymmetry between the campus and institutional bodies.² “This reflects the fact that governance and administration at the tri-campus level remains intertwined with the governance and administration of the St. George campus.”³

In addition, the *Task Force on Governance* (2010) paid particular attention to identifying those matters for which parallel or complementary review and consideration are appropriate, and determined that the goal of “delegation with continued oversight”⁴, which may appear iterative or redundant, is to enable the Governing Council to dedicate more time to strategic matters and, in turn, enable its Boards, Campus Councils and Committees to deal with substantive matters. Importantly, in the case of the UTM and UTSC governance bodies, there are occasions when matters considered by those bodies may still require consideration by one or more institutional bodies (e.g., capital projects, establishment of a new academic unit). This is to reflect that fact that decisions related to UTM and UTSC are still being made within the context of the University as a whole, and as such will have institutional implications.

² This is reflected in the design of the [governance bodies organizational chart](#) whereby the Campus Councils are in the same colour as the Boards (to reflect they have elements in common with the Boards) but they are placed at a different level than the Boards (to reflect that some items may still need to go to one, or more of the Boards, as part of the approval pathway).

³ [Report of the Task Force on Governance, June 22, 2010](#) at p. 38

⁴ [Report of the Task Force on Governance, June 22, 2010](#) at p. 45

COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE UTM AND UTSC CAMPUS COUNCILS (CRCC):

When the Governing Council approved the Terms of Reference for the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils and their Standing Committees in June, 2012, the resolution included a provision which mandated a review of the new governance model at the end of the first year of operation. In June 2014 the Governing Council struck the Committee to Review the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils to undertake such review.

The Committee to Review the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils reported its findings and recommendations to Governing Council on December 11, 2014.

The CRCC recommended a follow-up review of the tri-campus governance model in three years' time, that is, in the 2017-2018 academic year. On October 12, 2017 following approval by the Executive Committee⁵, the timing of the review of the tri-campus governance model was adjusted further to the recommendation of the Presidential Review with regard to a review of the tri-campus administrative structure.

The CRCC 2020 was established to fulfill the Governing Council's December 11, 2014 resolution to conduct a follow-up review of the tri-campus governance model. The Committee's [Terms of Reference](#)⁶ defined the areas of inquiry for the review process, including review of: aspects of the Terms of Reference of the Campus Councils (CCs), Academic Affairs Committees (AACs) and the Campus Affairs Committees (CACs) and ways to improve these Terms of Reference, specifically with regards to the appropriate role of the CACs and CCs in budget-related matters, as well as membership issues, namely the distribution of student seats, and the process by which the Chair and Vice-Chair of the CCs is determined.

The CRCC 2020's Terms of Reference also summarized consultation activities to be undertaken by the committee, including the issuing of a broad call for submissions to the University of Toronto community, and targeted communications to UTM and UTSC, including to the University of Toronto Mississauga Students' Union (UTMSU) and the Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU).

The CRCC 2020 was mandated to report to Governing Council in June 2020.

⁵ <https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/sites/default/files/ogc/reports/r1012-2017-2018ex.pdf>

⁶ <https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/2020-committee-review-utm-and-utsc-campus-councils-terms-reference>

Composition of the CRCC 2020:

The Terms of Reference required that the CRCC's membership comprise nine members drawn from the Governing Council and from the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils.

The membership of the CRCC 2020 was as follows:

- Ms. Jane Pepino (LGIC Governor, Vice-Chair of the Governing Council) – Chair
- Professor Wisdom Tettey (Presidential Appointee Governor; Voting Assessor - Vice-President and Principal, UTSC, UTSC Campus Council)
- Mr. Preet Banerjee (LGIC Governor; Chair of the UTSC Campus Council)
- Professor Mohan Matthen (Teaching Staff Governor; Chair of the UTM Campus Council)
- Dr. Tayyab Rashid (Administrative Staff Member, UTSC Campus Council; Chair, UTSC Campus Affairs Committee)
- Professor Joseph Leydon, (Teaching Staff Member, UTM Campus Council; Chair of the UTM Campus Affairs Committee)
- Ms. Sue Graham-Nutter⁷ (Co-opted Lay Member, Business Board and Audit Committee)
- Ms. Xing Wei (Full-Time Undergraduate Student Member, UTM Campus Council)
- Ms. Annie Sahagian (Full-Time Undergraduate Student Member, UTSC Campus Council)

The Secretary of the Governing Council, Ms Sheree Drummond, served as Secretary of the Committee, assisted by Ms. Tracey Gameiro, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council.

CRCC 2020 Work Plan:

Between March to May 2020, the CRCC 2020 invited input from the Chairs of all governance bodies encompassed within the review, as well as senior administrators and Assessors for UTM and UTSC, and also from the UTMSU and SCSU. During this time the Committee also issued a broad Call For Submissions to the University community.

At its first meeting (March 9, 2020) the Committee reviewed its Terms of Reference, approved its Work Plan, and reviewed relevant background information, including the [Report of the 2014 Committee to Review the Campus Councils](#)⁸, the [Memorandum to Governing Council regarding the mandate and design of the UTM and UTSC governance bodies \(June 2012\)](#)⁹, and the [Consideration of Budget Matters by UTM and UTSC Campus Councils and Campus Affairs](#)

⁷ Sue Graham-Nutter is a past Community Member of the UTSC Campus Council, and served on the 2014 Committee to Review the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils

⁸ https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/sites/default/files/ogc/reports/2014_CRCC.pdf

⁹ https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/sites/default/files/2020-03/04ii_CRCC_0.pdf

[Committee Memorandum \(September 2014\)](#)¹⁰. At this time the Committee also met with senior administrators of the Offices of the Vice-President & Provost and of the Vice-President, Operations and Real Estate Partnerships (the Assistant Provost, and the Assistant Vice-President, Planning and Budget), and received an update on consideration of budget matters by the Campus Councils and the CACs.¹¹

The online Call For Submissions was issued on March 13, 2020, and notice was broadly disseminated to all estates of the UTM and UTSC campuses, with a closing date of March 27, 2020. A small number of submissions were received, most of which addressed matters not relevant to the mandate of this Committee.

Due to the COVID 19 pandemic and restrictions in place with regard to physical distancing and work from home provisions, in-person consultation meetings were cancelled. Instead, those who had been invited to meet in-person with the Committee were asked to submit their comments in writing prior to April 10, 2020. Those canvassed included, the members of the senior administrative teams at UTSC and UTM, the leaders of the UTMSU and SCSU, and the Chairs of UTM and UTSC Standing Committees not already represented in the CRCC 2020 membership. The draft recommendations of the CRCC 2020 were also shared with the aforementioned individuals prior to the final meeting of the Committee.

¹⁰ <https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/sites/default/files/import-files/crccbudget10652.pdf>

¹¹ This update on budget matters was also provided to Governing Council at its September 11, 2014 meeting. See: <https://governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/sites/default/files/import-files/crccbudget10652.pdf>

CRCC 2020 FINDINGS:

The consultations undertaken by the CRCC 2020 were guided by its Terms of Reference, which informed the areas of inquiry for the review. The following is a summary of the input received.

The Process For Consideration Of Budget-Related Matters:

CRCC Terms of Reference:

1. Budget

The Terms of Reference of the Campus Affairs Committees (CACs) and the Campus Councils provide for a role for these bodies in considering the campuses' operating budgets (as part of the University's annual operating budget). From the outset, the Terms of Reference were not intended to assign approval responsibility of the budget to those bodies. In 2014 the Governing Council received a document entitled 'Consideration of Budget Matters by UTM and UTSC Campus Councils and Campus Affairs Committees'¹ that was a step toward clarifying the most apt role for the bodies in the annual budgeting process and the manner in which the provision might be fulfilled. It included a process map which has shaped the way in which budget matters have been considered by the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils and Campus Affairs Committees in the intervening years. At this juncture, there is a shared sense among the institutional and campus Assessors who are responsible for these matters that further refinement and clarification are necessary. The CRCC (2020) is to consider potential revisions to the current approach. In part its work shall be informed by the recently completed Tri-Campus Review, and particularly the work of the Administrative Structure and Budget pillars of that Review.

- Overall, there was general acknowledgment that UTM and UTSC should have greater autonomy and control over their annual budgeting processes, with a goal to engaging more fully their local communities as the campus budgets are developed for roll-up into the University operating budget. In the absence of administrative fora for engaging local stakeholders, governance meetings had become the locus of such discussions. In addition, it was observed that the existing approach to budget presentations did not strike the right balance between institutional-level focus and campus-level focus, were repetitive, and did not provide enough opportunity for robust discussion of the details of campus-specific budgets.
- It was suggested that the number of presentations on the campus operating budget at the UTM and UTSC governance meetings could be reduced, that local administrative processes of budget development be developed (this is outside the purview of governance but is an important element of the overall budget process), and that the focus of campus governance processes on campus-specific budget issues should be enhanced.

The Process For The Appointment Of The Campus Council Chairs:

CRCC Terms of Reference:

2. Leadership

The Chair and Vice Chair of the Campus Councils are elected by the members of the Governing Council on the respective Campus Councils. Practically speaking this means that a group of three people elect the Chair. In contrast the Chairs of the Boards (Academic Board, Business Board, University Affairs Board) are appointed by the Governing Council, on the recommendation of the Chair. The CRCC (2020) is to consider whether aligning the selection practices of the Chairs of the Campus Councils with those of the Boards would be appropriate.

- The Committee heard from the Secretary of the Governing Council and from CRCC members with first-hand experience that the process for electing the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Campus Councils had not been meaningful. This was not as a result of a lack of good will and commitment on behalf of those involved, but rather due to the realities of undertaking an election with a very small group (normally three people). As such, while the formal nomination process was undertaken, practically speaking this meant that informal conversations were had between those individuals and that an agreement was made that resulted in acclamations to the roles.
- The Committee heard support for aligning the appointment processes of the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the Campus Councils with those of the Boards, who are appointed by the Governing Council, on the recommendation of the Chair.

Increasing Student Participation In Governance:

CRCC Terms of Reference:

3. Membership

Historically, graduate and part-time undergraduate seats on the Campus Councils and their Standing Committees have generally been challenging to fill, while participation is strong among full-time undergraduate students. The CRCC (2020) is to consider whether a change in the current distribution of student seats on the UTM and UTSC governance bodies across the full-time undergraduate, part-time undergraduate, and graduate student constituencies to better reflect the student population of those campuses would be appropriate.

- The Committee heard from the Chief Returning Officer that since the inception of the Campus Councils it was frequently the case that the seats for part-time undergraduate students were unfilled, or would only be filled after re-opening the nomination period (sometimes more than once). It was speculated that this may be a result of the fact that the make-up of the student populations of UTM and UTSC is predominantly full-time undergraduate. In addition, some respondents suggested that low participation rates among part-time undergraduate students could be also attributed to the realities of some in that constituency in balancing the demands of work, family and studies.
- It was noted that the focus should be on ensuring that all student seats were filled so that there was a strong student voice in governance. It was suggested that this could be accomplished by combining the full-time and part-time undergraduate seats to allow for fungibility across these constituencies. This would not preclude an outcome whereby there were students from each of these constituencies, but should significantly increase the likelihood that no student seats would go unfilled. Some raised concerns that greater flexibility could result in a category of student not being represented in any one year. However, the Committee also heard that the student participation in, and impact on governance was better achieved by all student seats being filled than by vacant seats in a particular student category.

Enhancing Current Practice:

CRCC Terms of Reference:

4. Additional Refinements

In part based on information received through its consultations, the CRCC (2020) is asked to comment on any further refinements, which at the discretion of the Chair are consistent with the mandate of the Committee and scope of the review, which might enhance the ability of the Campus Councils and their Committees to execute their respective mandates and better align, if necessary, the Terms of Reference of the Academic Affairs Committees (AACs) and the Campus Affairs Committees (CACs) with current practices.

- A key finding of this review was the desire to align the Terms of Reference of the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils and Committees with current governance practices. To the extent the CRCC received commentary on this area of the review process, refinements indicated by the Secretariat focused on membership considerations, leadership appointments, and clarifying areas of responsibility of the respective bodies.
- It was noted that the reporting relationship between the Campus Councils and Governing Council was felt to be ambiguous and that a clearer articulation of that structure was required to reflect section 5.2 of the Campus Councils' Terms of Reference, which indicates that recommendations from the Campus Councils are for Governing Council approval (or Executive Committee, where approval is delegated).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The deliberative work and consultations undertaken by the CRCC, guided by its Terms of Reference, led to three recommendations for consideration by Governing Council, and a number of recommendations for the enhancement of current practice.

Recommendations to Governing Council:

(a) Budget

Building on the recommendations of the administrative Tri-Campus Review undertaken by the Vice-President and Provost¹², wherein there was recognition of the need for UTM and UTSC to have greater autonomy and control over their annual budgeting processes, such that the local community might be engaged more fully as the campus budgets are developed for roll-up into the University operating budget, the CRCC 2020 recommends changing the governance pathway for the campus operating budgets. Specifically, the CRCC 2020 recommends:

- i. reducing the number of presentations on the campus operating budget, by eliminating the Cycle 1 presentation on the campus operating budget to CAC and CC, and introducing a status report on respective campus strategic priorities by the UTM and UTSC senior administration to CAC and CC in Cycle 2;
- ii. including a presentation to the respective campus governance bodies on the comprehensive institutional operating budget, for information, as part of the existing Cycle 4 presentations by the Vice-President and Provost;
- iii. introducing a campus operating budget presentation by the respective Vice-President and Principal and Chief Administrative Officer of each campus, for information, in Cycle 5.

(b) Leadership

The CRCC 2020 recommends that the process for the appointment of leadership of the Campus Councils mirror that of the Boards whereby the Chair recommends the appointments to the Governing Council for approval. The Chair's recommendations are informed, as appropriate, by governors' nominations, governors' preferences, and having regard to needs and skills sets.

¹² See Appendix A: Table summarizing the proposed administrative and governance review pathway for the campus operating budgets. (Adapted with permission of the Offices of the Vice-President and Provost, and Vice-President, Operations and Real Estate Partnerships, March 2020)

(c) Membership

The CRCC 2020 recommends that the full-time and part-time undergraduate constituencies be combined with no change to the total number of student seats. This would allow for fungibility across these constituencies to ensure that all undergraduate seats are filled.

The recommendation for greater flexibility in the distribution of seats across the various student estates is aimed at supporting a stronger (collective) student voice to help ensure that every student seat is filled.

The Committee recognizes the ongoing need for efforts to raise awareness of governance, its importance, the opportunities for engagement, and the value and benefits of participation. In that regard, we also encourage Chairs, Vice-Chairs, Assessors, the Secretariat, and members to continue to identify and recruit interested prospective governance members.

Recommendations to Enhance Current Practice:

The past seven years of governance experience has shown that the Terms of Reference of the Campus Councils and the Standing Committees may require some minor refinements. Those refinements coalesce around the main themes of membership, leadership appointments, and areas of responsibility of the respective bodies.

When the revisions to the various Terms of References, further to the recommendations of this Report, are considered, the Committee suggests that this would also be the appropriate opportunity for the Campus Councils to consider any additional minor refinements for the enhancement of current practice as needed.

It was also noted that the expectation is that the UTM and the UTSC Campus Council Chairs report at the Executive Committee and the Governing Council on the items coming forward to those bodies from the Campus Councils for confirmation or for approval. On occasion, however, when the matter was one that was also considered by one of the Boards, this practice has been inadvertently overlooked. It is vital that the relevant Campus Council Chair always reports on items that originate from the respective Campus, regardless of whether the matter has also received consideration by a Board.

Appendix A – Proposed Administrative and Governance Pathway for Campus Operating Budgets

Administrative/Governance Review		Presenter
Governance Cycle 1		
CAC/CC	Orientation: discussion of the budget <u>process</u> and governors' responsibilities	Principal/CAO
Governance Cycle 2		
CAC/CC	Status report on Campus Strategic Priorities (for information). Principal/CAO report on enrolment, programs, services, capital projects, etc and an assessment of progress toward long-term goals. The focus is on strategic objectives, not budget allocations or funding sources.	Principal/CAO
Administrative Review		
Campus Review	Proposed budget themes and priorities	Principal to lead local, campus-specific review process prior to the Provost's Budget Review
Provost's Budget Review	Campus enrolment, complement, capital, expense plans	
TVP, P&D, PDAD&C	Consolidated institutional budget	
Governance Cycle 4		
P&B Committee	Institutional Operating Budget (for approval)	Provost presentation of institutional operating budget at Campus Councils
Campus Councils	Institutional Operating Budget (for information)	
Academic Board	Institutional Operating Budget (for approval)	
Business Board	Institutional Operating Budget (for recommendation)	
Executive Committee	Institutional Operating Budget (for endorsement)	
Governing Council	Institutional Operating Budget (for approval)	
Governance Cycle 5		
CAC/CC	Campus Operating Budget (for information)	Principal/CAO to present enrolment, faculty & staff complement, expense priorities.