

Meeting Notes
Planning and Budget Committee (PBC)
May 26, 2021
2:30 pm to 3:30 pm, WebEx

Attendance

M. Abrahams, VPA and Provost (Chair)

C. Bazan, Engineering

P. Brett, Marine Institute

S. Cadigan, AVPA

E. Kendall, Medicine

S. MacKenzie, Humanities and Social Sciences

A. Marland, Humanities and Social Sciences

K. Matthews, CIAP

L. Pike, Budget Office

J. Porter, Registrar's Office

M. Woods, Medicine

Unable to Attend

K. Anderson, Education

R. Nolan, CIAP

H. Usefi, Science

1. Review of agenda and meeting notes of April 28th, 2021

The meeting notes for April 28th, 2021 were approved as presented.

2. Updates

1. University Strategic Plan

The Board of Regents approved the new University Strategic Plan at its May meeting.

2. University Centres Policy

The proposal to review the "Establishment of University Centres" policy was submitted to Vice-Presidents Council and approved at its meeting of May 18th. The working group will now bring forward the revised policy for general consultation during the summer, with a goal of finalizing the policy for VPC and Board approval in the Fall.

3. University Strategic Plan – Implications on Oversight of Frameworks and Plans

The committee continued its discussion from its April meeting. K. Matthews distributed a document outlining the priorities, goals, objectives and enabling cultures of the new Strategic Plan as well as a summary of the current statuses of the various University Plans and Frameworks over which PBC has provided oversight. Discussion ensued:

- Does PBC have the capacity to undertake meaningful oversight of an increasing number of plans and frameworks?
- Should the Committee consider developing a taxonomy of plans to identify those institutional planning documents that fall under its purview?
- It was noted that the PBC does not evaluate unit strategic plans – should the Marine Institute and Grenfell Campus plans be similarly excluded? It was suggested that PBC should provide oversight for those plans that contain resource allocations (financial, physical, etc..) drawn from the Centre.

- Are there distinctions between “Plans” and “Frameworks” with respect to how they should be evaluated? Do the three cornerstone frameworks (Teaching and Learning, Research, and Public Engagement) require a different approach from the various other planning documents?
- Proponents often provide too much detail in their annual submissions. The committee’s review should be at a high level and focus on alignment with Strategic Plan
- There needs to be better instructions to proponents when soliciting updates on progress. Proponents should be encouraged to identify how their framework/plan is currently aligned with the new Strategic Plan, how it may need to be modified, and broadly, what the important metrics for evaluating progress should be, based on the goals and objectives in the Strategic Plan.

The Chair will write to the proponents, asking them to provide a brief, one-page report that outlines how the plan or framework for which they have responsibility currently aligns with the priorities outlined in the Strategic Plan and to what extent changes in performance measurement may be expected.

4. Policy on Academic Policies

The Committee received a document outlining a proposed policy on academic policies. Tom Nault, the Chair of the Senate Committee on Elections, Committees and Bylaws distributed the document to all Senate Committees, asking for feedback on how the document might affect their operations. Committee members welcomed the development of the policy, but felt that it has no direct impact on the operations of the committee.

The Chair will respond to Mr. Nault.

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM