



**BOARD OF GOVERNORS  
Strategy & Planning Committee (S&P)**

**Minutes of the Public Meeting of  
Thursday, October 24, 2019  
2:00 p.m. to 3:55 p.m., ERC 3023**

**Attendees:** Thorsten Koseck (Chair), Doug Allingham, Liqun Cao (*videoconference*), Kevin Chan (*videoconference*), Owen Davis, Steven Murphy, Jim Wilson (*videoconference*), Lynne Zucker (*videoconference*)

**Staff:** Becky Dinwoodie, Cheryl Foy (*videoconference*), Lori Livingston, Brad MacIsaac, Pamela Onsiang, Susan McGovern (*videoconference*)

**Guests:** Christine McLaughlin (Ontario Tech Faculty Association)

**1. Call to Order**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m.

**2. Agenda**

*Upon a motion duly made by D. Allingham and seconded by O. Davis, the Agenda was approved as presented.*

**3. Conflict of Interest Declaration**

There were none.

**4. Minutes of Public Session of Meeting of April 1, 2019**

*Upon a motion duly made by O. Davis and seconded by L. Zucker, the Minutes were approved as presented.*

## 5. Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the first committee meeting of the 2019-2020 Board year. The Chair introduced the new student governor, O. Davis, to the committee and welcomed him to his first committee meeting.

## 6. President's Remarks

The President reported it has been an incredibly exciting start to the year. The new brand has been received extremely well by the university's internal and external communities. He commented on the high level of student engagement in orientation, including the Student Union's activities under O. Davis' leadership. The President also discussed the opening of The Hive Café, which will be helpful in determining what students are looking for in terms of food.

(J. Wilson and L. Cao joined at 2:16 p.m.)

### Tech in Education

The university must be able to connect our students' online experience with the magic that happens on campus. While examining how to incorporate tech in education is not new to the sector, the key is differentiating ourselves. How to leverage strengths between institutions will be seen in years to come, as well as an "open tent" philosophy to learning and intellectual property.

### SMA3

The President remarked that the new performance-based funding of SMA3 will bring significant change to the sector. He reviewed the 10 KPIs that will be used to determine 60% of the university's funding. The university is currently in the process of negotiating the metrics with the provincial government and had their first meeting with the Minister earlier that week. The province requested a first draft of the SMA3 by the end of the year. The President will continue to keep the Board updated on the status of the negotiations.

### Strategic Priorities

The President provided an update on the progress being made on the university's strategic priorities. He noted that the university is becoming known for our automotive work, beyond electric and autonomous vehicles. It is also becoming known for our work in energy, which is significant given there are two nuclear reactors located in Durham Region.

The Chair commented that it is great to hear that the sticky campus initiatives are working and shared his recent experience attending his university reunion. The Chair also commented on the university's work relating to autonomous vehicles.

There was also a brief discussion regarding a start-up company in Toronto working on battery storage and the partnership opportunity it could present. The President asked L. Cao to send the name of the company to him.

## **7. Strategy**

### **7.1 S&P Terms of Reference Review**

B. Dinwoodie reviewed the proposed editorial amendments to the S&P Terms of Reference. A suggestion was made to change to add “at least once every 2 years” to the sentence “The Committee shall engage in broad strategic planning by reviewing and making recommendations to the Board on the following”.

*Upon a motion duly made by K. Chan and seconded by L. Zucker, the Strategy & Planning Committee (S&P) recommended the proposed amendments to the S&P Terms of Reference, as amended, for approval by the Board of Governors.*

### **7.2 Strategic Risk Annual Report**

C. Foy provided an update on the development of the strategic risk report, which was also set out in a report included in the meeting material. She discussed the progress that has been made on identifying and mitigating strategic risks. This year, the Risk Management Team will develop a process map of Operational Risks to Strategic Risks, as well as map strategic risks to the university’s strategic pillars. C. Foy asked the committee for their feedback on the proposed plan.

In response to a question regarding when the university might have a final strategic risk document in place that could be reviewed annually, C. Foy advised that the goal is to have the list of strategic risks finalized and mapped to the strategic pillars by the end of the year. The committee was supportive of this approach.

### **7.3 Strategic Mandate Agreement 3**

S. Murphy and L. Livingston provided an update on the status of the SMA3. There was a discussion regarding the level of transparency in negotiations with other institutions. S. Murphy commented that the implementation of the SMA3 will materially change the sector. The university is focused on minimizing the unintended consequences of the metrics. One of the goals of SMA3 is to make public institutions accountable for the funding received.

### **7.4 Strategic Discussion: Durham & Future of Energy**

S. Murphy introduced the strategic discussion topic. He advised that the concept of energy spans the vast majority of the university’s Faculties. Ontario Tech has built a name for itself in the auto sector. Society needs to become more informed as we move from a fossil fuel energy system to greener energy system and scientific evidence will

be helpful. The university is well positioned to be a leader in technological advances in energy, as well as on the policy side. How many Ontarians/Canadians know where their energy comes from? The source of energy varies greatly by region/province. It will be helpful to have a scientific perspective on the totality of the energy grid. This is a niche area in which the university has a lot of expertise and faculty are excited about working across silos to tackle energy issues. This is a natural fit and can be a defining characteristic of the university (“tech with a conscience”).

S. Murphy led the committee’s discussion. The committee considered whether there was any way to narrow the focus given the magnitude of the undertaking. It will be important to balance being visionary with being practical. There are quick wins to be had in sharing best in class technologies, as sectors tend to operate in silos. The objective of the initiative will not be to solve Canada’s entire energy problem but to be available to conduct independent assessments of energy and energy-related problems. It is also important to ensure that people know that we alone are not developing the solution. S. Murphy clarified that the university would not develop energy policies, but would provide the scientific support for governments to make decisions. The university should be perceived as being neutral.

There was a discussion regarding how the initiative could be used to develop a solution to provide energy to northern indigenous communities. There was also a discussion regarding the space required for autonomous vehicles.

The committee expressed support for the initiative. S. Murphy clarified that the work would not be accomplished alone – the university would partner with other think tanks. It will be integral to ensure that institutions are not duplicating efforts (e.g. working with University of Calgary, which is focused on the policy side). S. Murphy shared that he has had good discussions with recently retired CEOs in one of the areas. He acknowledged that it is a complicated solution and it will take more than just industry to develop it. The initiative would look for open-minded individuals who can reflect on the shortcomings of their industry. A member suggested that the advisory group include national leaders to ensure it is a truly national effort.

Once the university establishes credibility for energy expertise, that expertise can be extended to related transportation issues. It will be important to focus on the outcome we want to achieve. S. Murphy also shared the types of work integrated learning opportunities that would come out of such an initiative.

## **8. Planning**

### **8.1 Enrolment & Optional Ancillary Fees Model**

B. MacIsaac provided the committee with an update on the university’s Day 10 numbers, which was just under 10,500 students and a bit higher than last year. With respect to the optional ancillary fees, approximately 5% of the university’s students opted out, which is quite low compared to some other institutions (20/25%). The

committee discussed the strategy of educating students on the value of the student services supported by ancillary fees. B. MacIsaac confirmed that the five optional fees all related to the Student Union and totaled approximately \$31.12 of \$1500 in ancillary fees. He also advised that there was only a small difference in the percentage of undergraduates opting out (4.9%) versus graduates (5.3%). The student clubs are feeling it the most and had to decrease funding to clubs from \$750 to \$500. In order for a student to belong to a club, they must have paid the related ancillary fees. The university will continue to monitor the opt out rates. There was a suggestion made to reduce the length of the opt out period.

D. Allingham congratulated the team on the approach taken to the optional ancillary fees model.

## **8.2 Integrated Plan – Process**

L. Livingston updated the committee on the development of the university's integrated plan. She shared her experience during the interview process for the Provost role and how it shaped her development of the integrated plan process. She is working with Les Jacobs on the integrated plan. They have asked each unit leader to identify their top 3-5 priorities over the next 3-5 years. The priorities should align with the 5 key strategic pillars. Once their priorities are identified, they must set out an action plan for the next 18 months. L. Livingston confirmed it is a 5-year rolling plan approach, which allows for flexibility. Unit leads are also being asked to evaluate their progress against the plan. The change in the integrated plan process has been well received, so far.

L. Livingston reviewed the broad consultation with Faculty Councils, as well as regular updates to Academic Council. There will also be several Town Hall sessions. The final draft of the Integrated Academic Plan will go to Academic Council for approval in the new year.

Last year's integrated plan was 202 pages and the goal for this year is to settle on a 20-30-page plan, as well as an executive summary.

A member commented that the evaluation component is a great development, as it is important to review what was accomplished and it provides a sense of accountability.

## **8.3 Integrated Operational Planning (pre-budget)**

B. MacIsaac, P. Onsiang and L. Livingston presented the budget and planning update, which was included in the meeting material. B. MacIsaac discussed the university's strategy for increasing international enrolment. He explained the rationale for the international strategy. He confirmed that the university is using external recruiters for China and India. In response to a question about the "pre-approved asks", B. MacIsaac clarified that these are "one-time only asks" that have not yet been approved.

B. MacIsaac also explained the concept of “delayed hires”. L. Livingston explained that since there is no money in the budget to support new asks, it would not be productive to have people use their time and energy to prepare requests for new asks. The university is focusing budget cuts in areas where they would be least felt by the remaining staff and faculty. L. Livingston used the CAUBO conference as an example of reduction in professional development spending; historically, 12 representatives attended the conference whereas now will have only 1 person attend and report back to the others.

L. Livingston reinforced that the university is employing a strategy in an effort to not further demoralize staff and faculty. The university is also examining opportunities for revenue generating. There was a discussion about the effect of adding the moving ground plane to ACE and how it will increase revenues. ACE must first get through the downtime of the integration process. The Continuous Learning department is also conducting market research to develop additional revenue generating opportunities.

#### **8.4 Board Retreat Planning**

C. Foy discussed the timing of the spring retreat and suggested that the Board schedule the retreat for a similar time as last year - evening of May 27 and morning of May 28.

(C. McLaughlin left at 4:14 p.m.)

C. Foy reviewed the topics that were considered by S&P last year. The committee supported the topics of student mental health and the energy initiative. There is potential to engage an outside speaker for the student mental health topic. S. Murphy suggested approaching mental health from a different perspective by examining macro trends instead of an “inside the bubble” discussion. B. Dinwoodie will canvass the Board’s availability for the proposed May dates.

#### **9. Other Business**

#### **10. Adjournment**

*There being no other business, upon a motion duly made the meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.*

Becky Dinwoodie, Secretary