

Progress Report on the Implementation of the Findings of the Tri-Campus Review (2018-2020)

May 2023

Background

The University of Toronto has a unique tri-campus structure, bound together by a shared identity and common vision, with elements distinct to each campus. This structure is the product of more than 40 years of evolution, with the [Mississauga](#) and [Scarborough](#) campuses transforming from small undergraduate colleges to large and complex educational entities hosting a wide range of academic offerings, strong research programs, world-class faculty and librarians, and impressive, innovative facilities.

The evolution of U of T's tri-campus structure can be traced through several key documents.¹ From the [Tri-Campus Framework](#) (2002), which set out principles to guide the design of a new academic administrative framework, to the [Tri-Campus Letter of Understanding with UTFA](#) (2003), and two *Towards 2030* strategic planning documents ([2008](#) and [2012](#)), the University has strived to build on the best features of the excellent programs and services offered across three campuses and advance them.

Towards 2030 laid out the long-term vision of a region-wide University of Toronto comprised of three campuses with increasingly distinct strengths. This objective has not changed since *Towards 2030* was released fifteen years ago. However, tensions can surface between ideals and reality when it comes to implementing the principles articulated in *Towards 2030* and other key documents. Conflicts over specific academic or budgetary matters can sometimes find specific campuses on different sides of an issue or University decision.

In order to address those tensions and, more importantly, leverage the opportunities offered by U of T's unique tri-campus nature, the Provost launched a [Tri-Campus Review](#) in the Spring of 2018, which concluded in the Spring of 2020 and engaged in several implementation activities thereafter. The President and Provost chose a theme for the Review that echoed the collective vision so powerfully articulated in *Towards 2030*: "One University, Three Campuses." This review was the latest phase in the University's thinking about the collaborative relationship among the three campuses, building on similar activities that had taken place over the years in tri-campus budgeting, governance, and other areas.

The Tri-Campus Review was guided by a Steering Committee and built on five pillars, each with its own working group (pictured below). The Steering Committee brought together the Principals of UTM and UTSC, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, and the Chairs of each of the working groups. It provided a forum to share progress and to minimize overlap across pillars.

¹ A summary of these documents can be found in the [2018 Briefing Note](#) provided to members of the Tri-Campus Review Steering Committee and Working Groups.



Consultations

The working groups that made up the Review consulted for the better part of two years, online and in one-on-one and group meetings at all three campuses. In addition to presentations at meetings such as Principals & Deans and Academic Board, all academic administrators were invited to complete an online questionnaire, which garnered more than 100 responses (51 St. George, 35 UTM, 16 UTSC), and gathered broad information from dozens of chairs, graduate chairs and others about academic planning and academic change, as well as operational information about roles, structures, and processes in graduate units and administrative roles. Its purpose was to create a shared foundation of knowledge and data for the remainder of the consultation process and the work of each working group. This online questionnaire was complemented by in-person meetings on all three campuses with all Deans individually and most graduate chairs in groups, facilitated by Professor Alan Bewell, Special Advisor to the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and the Vice-Provost, Graduate Research & Education. Professor Bewell also met with student groups such as the U of T Graduate Students' Union and the UTM Graduate Student Association.

The five working groups themselves conducted extensive consultations with relevant stakeholders on all three campuses. For example, the Academic Planning and Academic Change (APAC) working group received input from an online survey, in-person consultation meetings with deans, and feedback from consultation meetings with graduate units. The Graduate Units working group held bi-weekly meetings to discuss existing policy documents and data gathered from surveys and consultation meetings with faculty members, chairs, graduate chairs, and students. The Budget Relationships working group established a sub-committee to review campus-specific administrative costs and sought information and advice from finance and administrative staff to inform discussions on campus and divisional cost structures. The sub-committee's work was incorporated into the recommendations in the final report. The Administrative Structures pillar conducted interviews with 18 senior academic administrators and administrative leaders, convened a breakfast event for department chairs, and presented at other meetings of senior U of T administrators on all three campuses. We would like to thank all those who participated in consultations, particularly as the end of Review coincided with the start of the pandemic.

Pillar 1: Administrative Structure

Mandate

The [Administrative Structure](#) pillar was chaired by Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-President & Provost, and considered topics related to tri-campus reporting lines and senior leadership structure, including:

- The relationships among the Principals, Deans, President, and Provost
- Differentiation of the roles of Principal and Dean at University of Toronto Mississauga and University of Toronto Scarborough
- The relationships and reporting of other administrative leaders, such as the University of Toronto Mississauga and University of Toronto Scarborough Chief Librarians, Registrars, Chief Administrative Officers, Vice-Principals Research, and Deans of Student Affairs

Themes

Promoting integration and collaboration

Students, staff and faculty thrive when the three campuses work together effectively - and when senior administrators and the units they lead operate as seamlessly as possible. This requires a commitment to break down silos and to integrate horizontally and vertically across campus lines, while preserving campus-specific decision-making and best practices.

Clarify senior leadership roles and responsibilities at UTM and UTSC

The primary focus here was differentiating the roles of Principal and Dean, where there had grown to be confusion over the years, especially regarding the responsibilities of the Dean at the UTM or UTSC campus in comparison with a Dean of a Faculty on the St. George campus.

Relationship to institutional portfolios

In many cases, there have been no direct reporting lines from senior leadership at UTM and UTSC to Vice-Presidential portfolios with tri-campus responsibility, nor has there been formal accountability from institutional portfolios to campus leaders. This has led to confusion, miscommunication, and institutional risk.

Recommendations and Progress

The group recommended a continuation of existing policy when it came to senior leadership positions. Campus Principals are the academic and administrative heads of UTM and UTSC with delegated authority to others. The Principal has certain areas of inherent authority under the [Policy on Appointment of Academic Administrators \(PAAA\)](#), including the budget, and can delegate responsibilities to the Dean, CAO, Vice-Principal Research, and others. The working group recommended that UTM and UTSC create matrices to document what activities fall into the inherent or delegated authority of the Principal or the Dean and other senior roles on those campuses – work that is underway at those campuses.

The group also endorsed clarity in terminology: for example, using the word *Institutional* (not *Downtown* or *Central*), and identifying *Campus* or *Division* or *Faculty* to bring more specificity to internal communications. These changes in commonly used terminology better reflect current tri-campus culture and operations, and have since been transmitted to shared services portfolios and U of T Communications.

The working group discussed enhancing collaboration between senior executives in institutional portfolios such as Provostial, Research and Innovation, and Operations & Real Estate Partnerships and their counterparts at UTM and UTSC. In some cases, dual or dotted-line reporting has been implemented, and there is now greater participation by tri-campus leaders in hiring processes, annual reviews, and other leadership activities for Associate and Assistant Vice-Presidents, Vice-Provosts, and Directors. The search process for Vice-Principal, Academic & Dean at both campuses has also been clarified, with the Vice-President & Principal leading those searches, with the Provost's support.

Finally, the working group supported increased investment in technology on all three campuses to allow hybrid attendance at meetings and more regular touch-bases among senior leaders in similar areas through video calls. This recommendation has been implemented as a result of the pandemic's impact, improving tri-campus coordination and communication on several fronts.

Pillar 2: Academic Planning and Academic Change

Mandate

Professor Susan McCahan, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, chaired the [Academic Planning and Academic Change](#) pillar (APAC) of the Tri-Campus Review. Members of APAC discussed questions related to new and changed programs as well as units, reviews, and academic planning – all under the umbrella of “One University, Three Campuses.” The working group mandate arose in part from issues that had arisen during recent academic reviews as well as program and unit development processes.

APAC considered some key items related to the mandate of the Graduate Units working group, including the U of T principle of a single (or ‘unitary’) tri-campus doctoral program, and the creation, modification, and review of academic units and graduate programs, fields, or concentrations.

In order to ensure collaboration with other parts of the Review, Professor McCahan worked closely with Professor Joshua Barker, Vice-Provost, Graduate Education & Dean, School of Graduate Studies; and Professor Heather Boon, Vice-Provost, Faculty & Academic Life, for consultation and development of the recommendations.

Themes

Academic excellence and student experience

All participants agreed that academic excellence should continue to be a top priority across the three campuses, and that institutional leadership has a key role to play in coordinating quality assurance and the academic planning that emerges from the cycle of review and change. Participants also viewed student experience as a critical component of program quality. In the context of U of T’s research-intensive mandate, high-quality student experience was often connected to interactions among research-active faculty, undergraduate and graduate students.

Unitary, tri-campus doctoral programs

There continues to be very strong support for maintaining the principle of a unitary, tri-campus PhD at U of T. This structure allows for the recruitment of excellent students and faculty, extraordinary supervisory capacity, and breadth and depth across disciplines, and plays a key role in the University’s international standing. However, consultations revealed challenges in facilitating inter-campus movement and collaboration. Some departments noted it is very difficult to support local faculty-student interaction in undergraduate programs while at the same time supporting faculty-student interaction in tri-campus PhD programs. There are unique challenges to programs that are lab-based or draw heavily on a single campus or Faculty.

Improved consultation for new academic programs and reviews

It was also clear from respondents that there is limited awareness of U of T’s principles to guide the development of new programs, units and other academic initiatives in a tri-campus context and differing interpretations on how to assess what the government calls “justifiable duplication” when it came to the development of new academic programs.

Overall, the APAC group identified a need to better define what consultation is required before starting new programs or modifying existing ones, and how to resolve disagreements when campuses have differences. In particular, tri-campus participation in external reviews involving graduate programs was described as critical, while there was less consensus on whether participation should extend to undergraduate program reviews as well.

Recommendations and Progress

The APAC working group's report and recommendations can be [found online](#). In summary:

- Provide more guidance to faculty, staff, and administrators working on developing new academic programs or arranging external reviews, including ideas like embedding such resources in [templates](#) already in use. This work is underway.
- Retain the principle of offering a single tri-campus doctoral program in any given area. And to more fully realize the potential of distinctive campus strengths within a single university, facilitate campus-based fields or concentrations within unitary PhD offerings. (It is noteworthy that the tri-campus planning context for PhD programs has materially changed since the time of the review, now that the government of Ontario has limited funding for doctoral expansion.)
- When creating new programs and academic units, differentiation, distinctiveness, and “justifiable duplication” should be considered in relation to a number of factors such as: academic excellence, scholarship and research areas, equity and diversity, student demand, scarce budgetary resources, critical mass of faculty, impact on cognate units and programs in the same or similar disciplines, and connections to other units through graduate faculty memberships. As such, the new program template has been updated to ensure this is addressed.
- Tri-Campus Deans groups can be important information-sharing and decision-making forums on tri-campus matters. There is an existing arts and science group, which the three associated deans should refresh with a clear terms of reference, meeting schedule, and set of agenda items. And Deans should come together to create similar tri-campus groups for Information, Management, and, in the future, other intensively tri-campus disciplines. The Provost can support the creation of these groups and their work through program planning, consultation, and faculty data analysis. The impetus for coordination should be on the various campuses and divisions involved.
- The working group recommended more bi- or tri-campus participation in reviews involving bi- or tri-campus graduate programs, as well as better guidance for participation of graduate chairs in undergraduate program reviews. The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs updated [Recommended Practices for Reviewing Programs Offered Across Units and/or Divisions – Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, University of Toronto](#) to address tri-campus graduate programs specifically.

Pillar 3: Graduate Units

Mandate and Context

Chaired by Professor Joshua Barker, Vice-Provost, Graduate Education & Research, and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, the [Graduate Units](#) pillar discussed questions related to graduate faculty membership, faculty and graduate searches, graduate chair responsibilities and graduate units.

In addition to a robust set of [recommendations](#), the working group prepared a [contextual document](#) to describe how tri-campus graduate units are structured at U of T across a range of disciplines. This context is important in order to interpret and implement the recommendations regarding tri-campus graduate units, graduate chair searches and other topics.

Specifically, these three points offer important context moving forward:

1. U of T's current situation is the result of a historical juncture of increased faculty hiring at UTM and UTSC with overall graduate expansion in terms of student enrolment.
2. Many members of the U of T community are not aware of the complexity of the University's graduate unit structure, especially the complexity of units with a different make-up than their own.
3. Consultations revealed that many faculty members do not understand the structure of their own appointments. Faculty members on the ground feel they are part of a rich tri-campus intellectual community rooted in our unique graduate structure. However, academic administrators like Chairs and Vice-Deans struggle with building faculty community – particularly in some areas at UTM and UTSC. There are best practices and routine processes we should all put in place to ease potential tensions and make faculty more aware of their own appointments and responsibilities on one or more campuses.

Themes

Graduate units at U of T can differ tremendously in their structure and in the composition of their faculty in terms of department and campus. Understanding the variety of contexts within which U of T students engage in graduate education clarifies the challenges that tri-campus graduate units can face. The Pillar highlighted that many challenges were not rooted in *inter-campus* relationships per se, but in the structural challenges of collaborating across unit, campus, and divisional boundaries.

For example, some graduate units, like Social Work, draw their faculty members almost exclusively from a single academic unit, such that the graduate unit overlaps perfectly with and becomes essentially indistinguishable from a budgetary academic unit in which faculty hold their primary appointments.

In other cases, graduate units draw their faculty members from a small number of academic units. This is the case for the graduate unit of Information, which draws faculty members from the Faculty of Information located on the St. George campus, and also from closely associated units at UTM and UTSC, such as the Institute of Communication, Culture, Information and Technology (ICCIT-UTM) and the Department of Arts, Culture and Media (UTSC).

Some graduate units draw their graduate faculty memberships from several units. For example, graduate faculty for the Institute of Biomedical Engineering come from multiple departments in the Faculty of Applied Science of Engineering and the Temerty Faculty of Medicine, as well as from the Faculty of Dentistry.

Finally, some tri-campus graduate units have a fairly even distribution of faculty members drawn from discipline-specific departments on each campus; such is the case for the graduate unit of Anthropology.

Recommendations and Progress

The Graduate Unit working group's recommendations can be found [online](#). Below is a brief summary of key recommendations and progress:

Campuses and divisions should take stock of where each graduate unit is in regard to its tri-campus connections in order to bring more intentionality to these relationships. The [School of Graduate Studies](#) supports graduate units to clearly outline tri-campus arrangements using template agreements (MOAs) to be negotiated among the campuses and divisions co-sponsoring a particular unit (more detail on progress below).

Faculty members with a graduate membership in a tri-campus unit should be made aware of the expectations (e.g., graduate teaching, doctoral supervision, contributions to graduate student funding packages) that come with that membership, in addition to their responsibilities in their primary budgetary unit. In order to provide graduate academic leaders with a clear and easy way to retrieve a picture of the faculty members who hold a [graduate faculty membership \(GFM\)](#) in a specific graduate unit, the Office of the Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life and the School of Graduate Studies are in the final stages of developing a GFM Data Dashboard for academic leaders, to be released in mid-2023.

Academic units should also consider the impact of their decisions on associated graduate units. It is important for the heads of all budgetary academic units to consult and engage the relevant graduate chair(s) regarding such matters as: faculty complement planning and hiring; teaching responsibilities and unit workload policies; and the role of graduate teaching and supervision in Progress-Through-the-Ranks (PTR), tenure and promotion.

Tri-campus graduate units should actively discuss how faculty members and students in their associated units receive information in order to improve internal communications. Other resources for graduate chairs were recommended, such as mentorship, template documents, and other guidelines, likely residing in SGS, which is tri-campus in scope. For example, as an action item following the release of the recommendations, SGS developed a document which provides guidance on the [Roles and Responsibilities of the Graduate Chair](#), in particular, noting areas which can or cannot be delegated to an Associate Chair or Director, Graduate Studies.

Capturing all these details remains a critical recommendation of the Graduate Units' Working Group, e.g. the creation of MOAs that detail the terms and conditions of tri-campus graduate units' collaboration with the campus-based budgetary units that make significant contributions to their graduate activities. To that end, the School of Graduate Studies appointed Professor Bryan Stewart as Special Advisor, Tri-Campus Graduate Unit Collaboration, on July 1, 2022, for a one-year term. Professor Stewart has so far provided leadership in finalising the template for MOAs to be used by tri-campus arts and science graduate units and has developed and implemented a process that will result in the signing of MOAs across a significant portion of tri-campus graduate units by June 2023.

A key recommendation is establishing a process for identifying which graduate units are, in fact, tri-campus. While in many cases it is clear whether a graduate unit belongs to one, two, or three campuses, there are a sub-set of graduate units that began as belonging to one campus only, but through demographic changes have evolved to become tri-campus. More work on this is underway.

One of the first recommendations to be implemented was the clarification and streamlining of graduate chair searches, particularly for tri-campus units involving multi-department Faculties. After a period of further consultation and partial implementation, the School of Graduate Studies and the three Tri-Campus Deans reconvened and clarified the recommendations in this area in January 2023. The original recommendations outlined a two-stage process to follow in these searches: first, a determination about the chair model would be made, and then either a single search or two searches would be conducted, depending on if the model chosen was separate or integrated. This particular recommendation turned out not to be feasible in practice. Rather, the School of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the Tri-Campus Deans, followed a two-stage process in which the first stage is determining whether to use a single search process or a dual search process and the second stage is to conduct the search(es). The question of which model to follow is thus made as part of the search process(es) rather than prior to the search(es) taking place. The revised recommendations, approved in a meeting of the Tri-Campus Deans Committee in January 2023, reflect this modified approach.

Pillar 4: Student Services

Mandate

Chaired by Professor Sandy Welsh, Vice-Provost Students, the [Student Services](#) pillar considered topics related to tri-campus responsibilities in providing student services, including:

- The current tri-campus nature of student service delivery
- Current reporting lines and governance for decision-making related to student services and the allocation of resources
- The appropriateness of the current modes of delivery in meeting student needs
- Consideration and mapping of campus-specific and tri-campus student services

The Tri-Campus Review overlapped with other important work in the area of student services and resources, including the [Budget Model Review](#), [the Student Mental Health Task Force](#), and [the Vision on Undergraduate Education](#). As a result, this pillar did not issue a final report with formal recommendations. Rather, the overlapping members of the various groups worked together on articulating guiding principles and moved into implementation.

Themes and Principles

This working group mapped student services on all three campuses in order to determine some principles for moving forward. In their meetings, the working group articulated principles to determine when it was appropriate to have more institutional oversight of service delivery to students on all three campuses, and when services should be assessed and operated on a single campus more autonomously.

The principles focused heavily on aligning student services with institutional tri-campus priorities like experiential and global learning opportunities, student mental health services, etc. The group prioritized the idea of “equitable access”, referring to the oversight and accountability to ensure that a given student service or program or activity is accessible to as many students as possible.

Another key focus area was compliance with the ever-changing legal and regulatory environment, as student fees pay for a huge part of student services. In particular, the group discussed tri-campus aspects of the organizational risks and liability associated with the proper stewardship of these funds, whether collected on behalf of student societies, a campus, a division, or the University.

Like the APAC pillar, this working group examined the concepts of organizational efficiency and duplication. Through the mapping exercise, this pillar considered whether some services that are offered campus-by-campus should really be offered on a University-wide basis (or vice-versa). The group also considered effectiveness, as defined as the evaluation and assessment of student services in order to promote an evidence-based approach to creating or changing non-academic services, programs and activities targeted at students.

Recommendations and Progress

The Student Services Pillar recommended establishing a new ‘middle table’ for administrators to have a regular venue for discussions about the administration and oversight of student services on all three campuses. This “Tri-Campus Student Services Meeting” would bring together leaders from the Dean of Students offices at UTM and UTSC, St. George Student Life, and the Office of Vice-Provost Students to advise on funding for institutional priorities and services; review and ensure consistent practice for

student fee approval processes; and review and assess changing the mode of delivery depending on student needs (in-person vs online). This last item became more acute from the pandemic in 2020 onward, leading to more coordinated and more accessible programming for students on all three campuses since the time of the review.

In response to this recommendation, a tri-campus meeting has been established with UTM, UTSC, the St. George Campus and the Office of the Vice-Provost Students (“Tri-campus Table”). In addition, UTM, UTSC, the St. George campus, the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education’s Sports and Rec team, Hart House and the Office of the Vice-Provost Students meet annually to discuss budgets and fee increases as a part of the annual student service fee budget process. In various other areas, tri-campus issues have been brought to the established Tri-campus Table.

The group also recommended that student service providers on all three campuses come together in topical areas to articulate and publish common service standards. Some of this work is underway through the implementation of the recommendations of the Student Mental Health Task Force, including the hiring of Chris Bartha, tri-campus Senior Executive Director, Student Mental Health Systems, Policy and Strategy.

As well, the working group recommended that Student Life providers on all three campuses (including the Deans of Students at UTM and UTSC, Hart House, St. George Student Life, and others) should assess the right balance of activities in various areas, and the mode of delivery for such activities in recognition of commuter students, graduate students affiliated with UTM and UTSC, and international students. These assessments have in many ways become easier and more coordinated in the pandemic, when all University offices were forced to think more about online programming and students working from home on different days of the week.

One area that was not fully explored by this pillar was athletics programming, including sports and recreation on all three campuses. Further work in this area will take place across the three campuses, including with the Faculty of Kinesiology & Physical Education on the St. George campus. Discussions are ongoing.

Pillar 5: Budget Relationships

Mandate

The [Budget Relationships](#) pillar was a component of both the Tri-Campus Review and a separate [Budget Model Review](#) that also took place from 2018-2020. This overlapping working group had a mandate to address questions related to budget, costs, and planning across the three campuses. Chaired by Scott Mabury, Vice-President, Operations and Real Estate Partnerships & Vice-Provost, Academic Operations, the Budget Relationships Pillar was made up of Chief Administrative Officers and finance leads from UTM, UTSC, and divisions on the St. George campus.

The working group's discussions involved determining the actual costs of various services or activities to clarify whether they were properly allocated to institutional, campus and/or divisional resources.

Themes

Throughout their consultations, there were some shared themes that emerged in this group's work:

Institutional vs shared service costs

The University needs to continue to separately define institutional costs and shared service costs, and improve transparency and understanding of these different sets of operational costs. Campus costs arise when UTM and UTSC - by virtue of geography - are unable to take advantage of a shared service delivered to multiple divisions at the St. George campus, resulting in campus-specific costs. The group identified a need for longer-term strategic planning around shared service delivery.

Graduate unit costs

During consultation, the Budget Relationships pillar uncovered a number of misconceptions about how much it costs to deliver graduate education, who pays and who benefits from these costs, and how money flows to cover the costs. In short: research-stream graduate education is not a profit-making enterprise for any campus or division. Rather, it is an important investment in advanced education and research, appropriate for a world-class institution like the University of Toronto.

Administrative and governance budget pathway

The University should consider the best administrative review and governance pathway for its [annual operating budget](#), one that allows for both institutional autonomy as well as the engagement of local chairs and unit heads, particularly at UTM and UTSC. The annual budget planning process should have an appropriate level of representation from campus leaders as well as affirm the tri-campus mandate of institutional administrators like the Vice-President & Provost and the Vice-President, Operations and Real Estate Partnerships.

Recommendations and Progress

The themes above culminated in this working group's recommendations, which included the following:

The University should more formally document the division of responsibility for service provision between and among shared service units, academic divisions, and campuses to provide more transparency. As part of this, the group recommended augmenting the shared service [budgeting process](#), which culminates in the work of the Divisional Advisory Committee (DAC), to establish regular communication channels when it comes to proposals for new investments. Relatedly, the working group recommended changes to the Academic Budget Review (ABR) process for UTM and UTSC to more clearly define the difference between budgets for academic units on each campus, and the budget for

campus-related activities. In response, several shared service portfolios have introduced new pre-DAC consultation processes where they can engage with campus and divisional leaders and administrators on priorities and potential new initiatives for investment. Work continues to enhance the annual Academic Budget Review process to provide dedicated space to discuss campus costs, separately from the academic operations of the divisions. These process refinements have been implemented in the last two budget cycles as a result of this review.

In relation to the costing exercise on graduate units, the group recommended that Planning & Budget provide campuses and divisions with more information on graduate program revenues and expenses. This has helped to dispel misconceptions about how much it costs to deliver graduate education including costs like teaching, supervision, space on multiple campuses, graduate funding packages, etc., who pays and who benefits from these costs, and how money flows to cover the costs. In response, the University has implemented a new doctoral contribution framework that will see increased sharing of graduate student funding package costs across partner divisions and campuses in the relevant tri-campus graduate program. In addition, the Planning & Budget Office has worked with other graduate units to improve understanding of revenues and expenses associated with research-stream graduate programs.

The group recommended implementation of the tri-campus inter-divisional teaching (IDT) framework as determined by the [IDT working group of the Budget Model Review](#). In response, the institutional IDT framework was extended to cover tri-campus undergraduate teaching activity beginning in 2020-21.

Because they are distinct campuses with their own facilities and capital projects, the group recommended adjusting the capital project management fees for UTM and UTSC to recognize their part in the shared responsibility for capital project management locally at those campuses.

Finally, the budget pillar supported the implementation of a revised governance pathway for the annual University operating budget. This has now been implemented as of January 2022. The new pathway scales back the presentations by institutional leads at UTM and UTSC, thereby encouraging more local administrative processes of budget development, and increasing the focus of campus governance processes on campus-specific budget issues following completion of the University-wide ABR and DAC processes.

Conclusion

Over the three years since the completion of this Review, important work has continued in all five pillar areas across all three campuses. Some of the highlights were noted above, and other more minor changes and practices have been adopted in offices and units as a result of the themes and recommendations identified.

The incredible resilience demonstrated by faculty, librarians, staff, students, and other members of the U of T community during the pandemic also contributed to accelerating the implementation of many of the recommendations of this Review between March 2020 and the present. Of particular note is the technological revolution that occurred with regard to hybrid and online meetings, allowing much of the work done in communities of practice across the three campuses to take place more intentionally in a bi- or tri-campus manner.

In other areas not covered by the Tri-Campus Review, work is also ongoing to coordinate amongst the three campuses, find more effective ways to offer programming and services, and to build relationships. First-entry divisions are aligning their sessional dates under the leadership of the University Registrar's office and the Division of People Strategy, Equity & Culture. A new Executive Director of Internal Communications will be supporting consistency in U of T's communications with internal stakeholders including employees and students.

As well, these conversations have influenced the approach to many subsequent tri-campus initiatives, such as the Student Mental Health Transformation. There is now one University-wide electronic medical record for students who access services to improve services and receive care at the University's health centres regardless of their campus registration. As noted above, a tri-campus Senior Executive Director, Student Mental Health Systems, Policy and Strategy was hired to continue facilitating access to services for every student.

This Review touched on many aspects of University life. From the structure of academic units to the future of academic planning, from the growth of graduate activity on all three campuses to the needs of students in all aspects of their experience at University of Toronto, and from the nature of faculty appointments and responsibilities to the complex budget relationships across divisions and campuses – the advantages of our unique tri-campus structure are clear.

In the years ahead, the University will continue implementing a balance of structural and procedural changes as well as more informal culture change to foster the inclusion of colleagues and students on all three campuses. More attention needs to be paid by all of us to our unique tri-campus structure, taking the time to visit a campus we may never have been to, or reaching out to our counterparts on another campus. With this progress report, we wish to acknowledge the hard work of all U of T community members to advance the ideal of "Three Campuses: One University."

Appendix: Membership of the Steering Committee and Working Groups (2018 – 2020)

Steering Committee of the Tri-campus Review

Cheryl Regehr, Vice-President & Provost (Chair)

Joshua Barker, Vice-Provost, Graduate Research & Education and Dean, School of Graduate Studies

Melanie Woodin, Dean, Faculty of Arts & Science

Alexandra Gillespie, Vice-President & Principal, University of Toronto Mississauga

Scott Mabury, Vice-President, Operations and Real Estate Partnerships & Vice-Provost, Academic Operations

Susan McCahan, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs and Vice-Provost, Innovations in Undergraduate Education

Wisdom Tettey, Vice-President & Principal, University of Toronto Scarborough

Sandy Welsh, Vice-Provost, Students

Pillar 1: Administrative Structure

Cheryl Regehr, Vice-President & Provost (Chair)

Larry Alford, Chief Librarian, University of Toronto Libraries

Heather Boon, Vice-Provost, Faculty & Academic Life

Sheree Drummond, Secretary, Governing Council

Vivek Goel, Vice-President, Research & Innovation

Erin Jackson, Chief Human Resources Officer

Bruce Kidd, Former Vice-President & Principal, University of Toronto Scarborough

Ian Orchard, Vice-President & Principal, University of Toronto Mississauga

Wisdom Tettey, Vice-President & Principal, University of Toronto Scarborough

Pillar 2: Academic Planning & Academic Planning

Susan McCahan, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs and Vice-Provost, Innovations in Undergraduate Education (Chair)

Amrita Daniere, Vice-Principal, Academic & Dean, University of Toronto Mississauga

William Gough, Vice-Principal, Academic & Dean, University of Toronto Scarborough

Patricia Houston, Vice-Dean, MD Program, Faculty of Medicine

Gretchen Kerr, Vice-Dean, Programs, School of Graduate Studies

Penelope Lockwood, Vice-Dean, Academic Planning & Strategic Initiatives, Faculty of Arts & Science

Tiff Macklem, Dean, Rotman School of Management

Richard Sommer, Dean, John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design

Pillar 3: Graduate Units

Joshua Barker, Vice-Provost, Graduate Research & Education and Dean, School of Graduate Studies (Chair)

Dwayne Benjamin, Vice-Dean, Graduate Education, Faculty of Arts & Science

Heather Boon, Vice-Provost, Faculty & Academic Life

Kenneth Corts, Vice-Dean, Faculty & Research, Rotman School of Management
Wendy Duff, Dean, Faculty of Information
Michael Escobar, Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs, Dalla Lana School of Public Health
Ryan McClelland, Associate Dean, Academic & Student Affairs, Faculty of Music
Jeremy Packer, Associate Dean, Graduate, University of Toronto Mississauga
Mary Silcox, Vice-Dean, Graduate, University of Toronto Scarborough

Pillar 4: Student Services

Sandy Welsh, Vice-Provost, Students (Chair)
Joseph Desloges, Principal, Woodsworth College
Ira Jacobs, Dean, Faculty of Kinesiology & Physical Education
Heather Kelly, Senior Director, Student Success
John Monahan, Warden, Hart House
Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs, University of Toronto Mississauga
Desmond Pouyat, Dean of Student Affairs, University of Toronto Scarborough
Charmaine Williams, Acting Vice-Dean, Students, School of Graduate Studies

Pillar 5: Budget Relationships

Scott Mabury, Vice-President, Operations and Real Estate Partnerships & Vice-Provost, Academic Operations (Chair)
Andrew Arifuzzaman, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto Scarborough
Judith Chadwick, Assistant Vice-President, Research Services
Brian Coates, Chief Financial Officer, Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering
Nancy Edwards, Chief Financial Officer, Faculty of Medicine
Mary Lyne, Chief Administrative Officer, Rotman School of Management
Kim McLean, Chief Administrative Officer, Faculty of Arts & Science
Trevor Rodgers, Assistant Vice-President, Planning & Budget
Susan Senese, Interim Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto Mississauga