

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 63 OF
THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

July 25, 2000

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, July 25, 2000 at 2:00 p.m. in the Dean's Conference Room, Medical Sciences Building with the following members present:

Professor David Mock (In the Chair)
Professor Ronald Venter (Vice-Chair)
Dr. Robert J. Birgeneau, President
Professor Adel S. Sedra,
Vice-President and Provost
Ms Janice Oliver, Acting Vice-
President, Administration and Human
Resources
Professor Derek McCammond,
Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Professor Carl Amrhein
Mr. Brian Burchell
Professor Raymond Cummins
Mr. Brian Davis
Professor Angela Hildyard

Professor Susan Horton
Professor Bruce Kidd
Professor Robert McNutt
Professor Nancy Reid
Professor Ken Sevcik
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy Provost

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs
Ms Susan Girard

Regrets:

Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad
Professor Ruth Gallop
Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski

Professor Avrum Gotlieb
Mr. Fayez Quereshy
Professor Fred Wilson

In Attendance:

Professor David Beach, Dean, Faculty of Music
Mr. Mark Britt, Director, Internal Audit Department
Ms Sheila Brown, Controller and Director of Financial Services
Professor John Browne, Director of Residence Development
Professor Michael Charles, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Audrey Chung, Director of Research Grants
Professor Umberto De Boni, Associate Dean, Division IV, School of Graduate Studies
Dr. Jack Dimond, Co-ordinator, Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor Precinct Project
Ms Mary Jane Dundas, Chief Administrative Officer, Woodsworth College
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant Provost

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Mr. Graham Kemp, Director, Administrative Management Systems
Ms Manon Le Paven, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students
Mr. Darren Levstek, President, Woodsworth College Students' Union
Professor Rhonda Love, President, University of Toronto Faculty Association
Ms Carole Moore, Chief Librarian
Dr. Peter Munsche, Assistant Vice-President, Technology Transfer
Ms Cristina Oke, Assistant Vice-Provost, Professional Faculties
Professor Larry Richards, Dean, Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design
Professor Wes Shera, Dean, Faculty of Social Work
Ms Lynn Snowden, Assistant Vice-Provost, Arts and Science
Professor Vic Timmer, Faculty of Forestry
Professor Arthur Vandenbroucke, Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology
Ms Fran Wdowczyk, Manager of Student Housing and Residence Life, University of Toronto
at Scarborough

THE MEETING WAS HELD IN OPEN SESSION. ITEMS 4, 5, 6, 7 AND 8 ARE RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL.

Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed the President and the members to the first meeting of the Committee for 2000-2001. He invited members to introduce themselves.

The Chair then reviewed the Committee's structure, its rules and procedures, and invited members to contact him, the Provost, or the Secretariat at any time throughout the year if they had questions about the Committee or its business.

1. Reports of the Previous Meetings

Report Number 61 (May 24, 2000) and Report Number 62 (June 7, 2000) were approved.

2. Business Arising from the Reports of the Previous Meetings

The Chair recalled that Professor Sedra had agreed to provide a report in the fall on physical accessibility, arising from Report Number 61. There were no other items of business arising.

3. Senior Assessor's Report

(a) Enrolment Growth

Professor Sedra reminded members that the Committee had reviewed the *Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto* and, on the recommendation of the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board, the Governing Council had endorsed the document in May, 2000. It laid out a framework to develop plans to increase enrolment if and when the opportunity arose. He reported that a week ago, the Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities had requested detailed plans for enrolment growth. The deadline for submission of the plans was August 15. The administration was preparing a response, guided by the *Framework* document. There was some ambiguity about the degree of detail required and this point was being

3. Senior Assessor's Report (cont'd)

pursued. Dr. Birgeneau indicated that an intermediate level of detail would be supplied; the University did not want to lock itself into a particular plan too early in the process. The Ministry would circulate all responses - marked "draft" - among the Ontario universities. Finalized plans were requested by the end of September. Professor Sedra undertook to circulate the draft response to the members of the Committee.

(b) Canada Research Chairs Program - Update

Professor Sedra stated that the Canada Research Chairs Program was an exciting opportunity to enhance research and teaching activities at the University. At its June meeting, the Committee had recommended endorsement of the *Framework for Allocating Canada Research Chairs at the University of Toronto*. The *Framework* had later been endorsed by Governing Council at its meeting on June 29th. The group of Principals and Deans had recently had an all-day retreat and were currently preparing proposals for research clusters, including those that crossed a number of academic divisions. By September 1, the University was required to submit its strategic research plan and the first group of nominations for a portion of its 45 chairs. There would be two other opportunities to submit further nominations - in December and March. In response to a question, Professor Sedra confirmed that the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments* would be followed in the nominations for the chairs. He noted that Immigration Canada had waived the normal two-tiered process for searches and that universities would be able to advertise internationally immediately.

A member asked if the Chairs program could be used to make appointments of opportunity. Professor Sedra indicated that appointments to chairs would not be made on a one-off basis. If, however, the person was outstanding and was a good fit for a particular research cluster, an appointment to a chair would be considered. He added that there were other opportunities to hire excellent faculty members as members would see in the discussion of the divisional plans.

4. Budget: Administrative Priorities Fund and Administrative Transition Fund - Allocations

The Chair noted that the Committee considered allocations from designated funds, in this case from the Administrative Priorities Fund (AdPF) and the Administrative Transition Fund (AdTF). Professor McCammond's memorandum outlined the origin and uses of these funds.

Professor McCammond introduced the allocations as outlined in his memorandum dated July 12, 2000, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A". He explained briefly that the AdPF was funded by an annual 1.5 percent reallocative cut to the budgets of the administrative divisions and by an allocation of \$1 million approved in the *Budget Report 2000-2001*. The *Budget Report* also included an allocation of \$1.8 million to the AdTF in 2000-2001. He said that the proposed allocations exhausted the funds in the AdPF for this year but left the funds from the reallocative cuts for the years 2001 to 2004 available for future distribution. The AdTF would have \$2.2 million remaining for allocation during the remainder of the planning period to 2004.

Professor McCammond reviewed the proposed allocations and responded to questions. During the presentation, a member asked the amount of the reallocative budget cut to each division receiving an allocation.

4. **Budget: Administrative Priorities Fund and Administrative Transition Fund - Allocations** cont'd)

- Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations - this was a new portfolio and, therefore, there had been no reallocation cut.
- Internal Audit - the reallocation cut was \$8809.
- Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources - the reallocation cut was \$524,000. In response to a question, Professor McCammond said that the space audit being conducted by the C.O.U. and OAPPA would involve all three campuses. A member asked about future changes in licensing costs for the SAP software. Mr. Kemp responded that the University had a long-term agreement that limited increases to 3 percent per year.
- Vice-President, Research and International Relations - the reallocation cut was \$51,000.
- Office of the Governing Council - the reallocation cut was \$11,000.
- University of Toronto Archives and Record Management Systems – UTARMS had no base budget and, therefore, no reallocation cut. In response to a question, Professor McCammond said that the corporate records mentioned referred to the records of disposition of the University's endowment lands in the 19th century.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the following allocations from the Administrative Priorities Fund (AdPF) and the Administrative Transition Fund (AdTF) be approved:

- (i) Office of the Vice-President, Government and Institutional Relations: \$295,000 in base from the AdPF and \$100,000 OTO from the AdTF;
- (ii) Internal Audit: \$8,809 in base from the AdPF and \$35,000 OTO from the AdTF;
- (iii) Office of the Vice-President, Administration and Human Resources: \$858,000 in base from the AdPF and \$705,000 OTO from the AdTF;
- (iv) Office of the Vice-President, Research and International Relations: \$553,057 in base from the AdPF and \$460,000 OTO from the AdTF;
- (v) Office of the Governing Council: \$108,650 in base from the AdPF and \$217,100 OTO from the AdTF; and
- (vi) University of Toronto Archives and Record Management System (UTARMS): \$110,000 OTO from the AdTF.

The motion was carried unanimously.

5. Capital Project: Woodsworth College Student Residence - Users' Committee Report

The Chair stated that the Committee considered reports of users' committees and recommended to the Academic Board approval in principle of projects. The four elements on which the Committee made its recommendations were: site, space plan, cost, and sources of funds. In the present case, the Committee was also being asked to recommend approval of an expenditure from the Academic Priorities Fund.

Normally, recommendations concerning capital projects proceed to the Academic Board and then to the Governing Council for approval. In the case of residence projects, the University Affairs Board provided its advice to Governing Council on the student-life aspects of capital projects. The Business Board reviewed the business plan only for cost-recovery projects, and advised the Governing Council on financial viability.

The Chair explained that because the University wished to begin construction as soon as possible, the approval process in this instance would be shortened and would proceed as follows:

- this Committee would consider the users' committees' reports
- the University Affairs Board would hold a special meeting on August 10 to consider the users' committees' reports
- the reports were sent to the members of the Business Board for comment. Any interested members of that Board had also been invited to attend this meeting
- if the users' committees' reports were well received by all concerned, they would be approved by the Chairman of Governing Council and the President under summer executive authority. The normal course of events would have required waiting for approval by Governing Council at its meeting in mid-October

Professor McCammond noted that this Users' Committee Report was the first visible result of the endorsement by Governing Council in November, 1999, of the directions and priorities in the document, *Expanding Residence Capacity at the University of Toronto*. It was expected that a total of five users' committee reports for residences would be considered by the Committee in the next few months. Those from New College, University College and the University of Toronto at Mississauga would be presented shortly. A sixth project involving the Varsity/Devonshire/Bloor precinct was also being developed.

It was proposed that the Woodsworth College residence house 348 full-time students and nine dons in suite-style accommodation. Five suites would be fully wheel-chair accessible and the building would incorporate wide doors and other features which would ensure accessibility throughout the building. The residence would be built on the site at the southeast corner of St. George and Bloor Streets, the site currently occupied by the St. George Graduate Residence. It was planned to start construction after the spring term, that is in April 2001. With respect to the financing, Professor McCammond noted that the usual practice with residences was that they were constructed on a self-funding basis, financed by the room rates. However, residence construction costs had increased dramatically over the last few years. For example, when the graduate residence was in the planning stages, the costs were projected to be about \$40,000 per bed. The final amount was about \$55,000 per bed. Costs were now over \$70,000 per bed. It would be impossible to fund the mortgage from room rental rates and at the same time keep the room rates at a reasonable level. It was, therefore, proposed that Woodsworth College receive an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund (A.P.F.).

Professor McCammond noted that this was the first residence for Woodsworth College. Therefore, unlike the other colleges, it did not have an ancillary reserve to use as a

5. **Capital Project: Woodsworth College Student Residence - Users' Committee Report** (cont'd)

down payment. The allocation of \$1.024 million per year of base funding would be provided for eight years, at which point it was expected that the residence operation would be in a surplus position and the allocation would be reviewed. Professor McCammond explained that the allocation financed \$13 million of the \$27 million project cost. In closing, Professor McCammond indicated that an updated financial plan had been placed on the table.

In discussion, the following points were raised:

- **Small study rooms** - A member noted that the Users' Committee Report (middle of page 7) stated that small study rooms allowed group work which might include non-resident students. He suggested that the "might" be changed to "should." It was important to draw the non-resident students into the College community. As such, the study rooms would have to be readily accessible to non-resident students and their placement would need to be carefully considered. Professor Hildyard, Principal of Woodsworth College, agreed to take this point under advisement.
- **Large classroom** - A member said that the wording about classrooms as part of the project was ambiguous. He did not understand how the process of arriving at the decision to include a classroom would be made. Funding for classrooms came from a different source and he asked at what point the decision on funding was needed in order for the classroom to become part of the residence project. Professor Hildyard indicated that she had hoped that there could be a large underground classroom included in the project. She would be pleased to include it if the funding was possible. Professor McCammond explained that once the design process was begun, it would be determined if including the classroom was possible and how much it would cost. Professor Sedra noted that the implementation committee would be instructed to look carefully at the feasibility and cost of including a classroom in the project. The classroom could be 500 or 1500 seats. Another member said it was important to make a decision at an early stage in the project and avoid costly alterations to the plans.
- **Affordable rents** - A member noted that the allocation in support of this residence was necessary to carry the mortgage if affordable rents were to be charged. He asked how the amount of affordable rents was decided. Professor McCammond said that the current rates were multiplied by an inflation factor and increased slightly because the residence would be new. Professor Browne added that a survey had been done of other universities. Residence rates at this University were slightly higher. Projecting them out to 2007, this University's rates would be slightly above the norm, about \$100 more than those at other institutions. The member suggested that a one-bedroom apartment in this area would cost about \$1000 a month. He asked why \$550 per month (\$4400 per year) was considered the "affordable" rate. Professor Browne explained that he had reviewed some CMHA data which showed one-bedroom apartments cost \$850 per month. The proposed rate was below that but students were also housed in groups of four or six.

Another member noted that this year, some students had been housed in a hotel off campus. That experience had shown that students wanted to be on campus. The right room rate was also important, however. This University must compete with other universities for students and the rates must be comparable. If the University charged Toronto rates, it would be at a disadvantage in attracting students. Principal McNutt indicated that the rate charged at UTM was lower, approximately \$3500 per year.

5. **Capital Project: Woodsworth College Student Residence - Users' Committee Report** (cont'd)

- Commercial revenue - The member recalled that there had been discussion about potential commercial revenue derived from the Bloor Street frontage. This was not part of the project and he asked about the opportunity cost. Professor McCammond said that the Users' Committee was guided by desires of the University community which seemed to be moving away from leasing its property for commercial purposes. Dr. Dimond recalled that recent reports on student residences had called for increasing the proportion of students housed on campus. In order to accommodate 25 percent of students on campus, the University would have to build 2400 new beds in the precinct bounded by Spadina Avenue, Bloor Street, Queen's Park Crescent and College Street. The University needed to use the sites it had designated as surplus to academic requirements. It was foregoing commercial revenues but it was gaining residence places. There had been a 150 percent increase in the number of first-year students asking for residence places.
- Site 26 - In response to a question, Professor McCammond confirmed that the site consisted only of the envelope on which the current St. George Graduate Residence was situated and did not include any houses or other surrounding buildings.

Ms Oliver explained that the architects were selected by the Physical Planning and Design Advisory Committee (P.P.D.A.C.). The process could vary. Two members of the Committee and herself produced a short list of six firms to present to the Committee for consideration. The Committee, a representative of the relevant users' committee, Miss Oliver and her staff interviewed the architects. The Dean of the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design was an *ex officio* member of P.P.D.A.C.

- Allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund - A member indicated that he had two concerns. One was the apparent subsidization of the building of residences using the A.P.F. He understood that residences were an important recruitment tool and that the setting of rental rates at an affordable level was necessary in a competitive environment. This battle had already been fought and the allocation appeared in the Budget Report. His second concern was the unequal subsidization of the residences. Woodsworth's allocation was over \$1 million and Scarborough's was only \$200,000. Professor Sedra, responding to the second point, stated that the difference was not due to unequal treatment between the St. George and Scarborough campus residences. Woodsworth did not have a residence at this time and consequently had had no opportunity to accumulate funding from the operation of one residence to help fund the next one. The administration proposed that the College be given financial help to get started. The onus remained on the colleges and faculties who had residences to provide the downpayment from funds saved from their current operations. The divisions could not use their savings for other purposes and then ask for an allocation from the A.P.F. to build more residence space. The member noted that the funds in the residence ancillaries had been put to good use in the past. He understood that the funds must be spent on residences.

Professor McCammond explained that residences had been built at regular intervals in the past. The divisions had been able to accumulate downpayments before embarking on the next phase. However, since the University was entering a period of residence expansion, buildings were being proposed at a faster rate than previously and there was no accumulated surplus. Besides the allocations for Woodsworth and Scarborough, allocations would be proposed for the New College (\$190,000) and University College (\$200,000) residences. For those divisions with existing facilities,

5. **Capital Project: Woodsworth College Student Residence - Users' Committee Report** (cont'd)

the allocations were much lower; Woodsworth was the exception, with no existing facilities.

In response to a question, Professor McCammond said that the University had been unsuccessful in attracting private sector funding for residences. For example, the major efforts to interest donors in supporting Graduate House had not resulted in any support.

- Kruger Hall - A member asked whether any changes to Kruger Hall were part of this approval process. Professor McCammond responded that any plans concerning the Hall would have to be presented to this Committee and that none were included in the proposal currently before the Committee.
- Approvals Required from the City of Toronto - A member asked whether there were any outstanding approvals needed from the City. Professor McCammond responded that the University had an approved envelope for the site and approval to demolish the current building on the site. Dr. Dimond indicated that there were a number of issues still to be resolved such as the set back from the street and whether the building would be 10 or 11 storeys high.
- Open Space - A member asked about the open space surrounding the new building. Dr. Dimond indicated that there would be an increase in the open space on this site and the surrounding sites. How the space was organized, planned and designed would be guided by the Open Space Plan. One suggestion was a quadrangle between the residence and neighbouring buildings.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

(i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Woodsworth College Student Residence (dated 18 July, 2000), a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", proposing a 14,000 gross square meter building on site 26 on the St. George Campus, be approved in principle;

(ii) THAT the project cost of \$27 million be approved;

(iii) THAT the sources of funding, a 25-year mortgage to be repaid from residence fees and an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund, be approved; and

(iv) THAT base funding of up to \$1,024,000 per year be allocated from the Academic Priorities Fund to Woodsworth College for a period of 8 years, the allocation to be reviewed at the that time.

The motion was carried unanimously.

6. Capital Project: University of Toronto at Scarborough Student Residence (Phase 4) - Users' Committee Report

Professor McCammond introduced the proposal for Phase 4 of the residences on the University of Toronto at Scarborough campus. It was proposed that the new residence contain 203 beds in an apartment-style configuration at a cost of \$13.7 million. Two of the three-bedroom units would be fully accessible and the entire building would employ the principles of Universal Design - wide doors and other features - that would make the building accessible for those with lesser disabilities. The exact site on the Scarborough campus has not yet been determined. An allocation from the A.P.F. of \$204,000 per year for eight years was being recommended. This allocation would be reviewed at the end of the eight-year period.

A member expressed his dismay at the rising cost of construction. Miss Oliver said that the costs projected in the Users' Committee Report were being borne out in the construction currently underway on campus, particularly with respect to the Bahen Centre for Information Technology. The construction industry was in a boom period. Professor McCammond added that several cost consultants had been employed to confirm the University's estimates.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

- (i) THAT the Users' Committee Report for the Scarborough College Student Residence (dated 11 July, 2000), a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C", proposing a 7,558 gross square meter building on the Scarborough Campus be approved in principle;
- (ii) THAT the project cost of \$13.7 million be approved;
- (iii) THAT the sources of funding, a 25-year mortgage to be repaid from residence fees and an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund, be approved; and
- (iv) THAT base funding of up to \$204,000 per year be allocated from the Academic Priorities Fund to Scarborough College for a period of 8 years, the allocation to be reviewed at the that time.

The motion was carried unanimously.

7. Discontinuation of Programs

(a) Woodsworth College - Diploma and Certificate Programs

Professor McCammond introduced the proposal from Woodsworth College to discontinue three certificate programs and one diploma program. Documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "D". He explained that student demand for the certificate programs in criminology and in law enforcement and administration had declined since the College had introduced both major and specialist degrees in criminology. The College believed that the academic needs in this area were being met by the degree programs. Student enrolment in the business program was also declining and the College believed that some of the need in this area was now being met by the undergraduate degree program in commerce. Consultation with the Rotman School of Management was continuing. The final program,

7. Discontinuation of Programs (cont'd)

the diploma program in gerontology, had also experienced declining enrolments. Discussions had been held with the Institute for Human Development, Life Course and Aging and the School of Graduate Studies about the possibility of upgrading the diploma to a master's level program. To date, there had been no progress on this issue. Total loss of tuition revenue would be \$187,000.

In response to a question, Professor Hildyard indicated that those currently in the program would be able to finish. New enrolment would cease.

A member noted with concern the closing of these programs. Those interested in criminology and law enforcement were now forced to enrol in a 20-credit degree program instead of taking a six-course program which could be completed in a shorter time. She said that she would have liked to have seen a new business program in place before the old certificate program was discontinued. Finally, she expressed regret that the program in gerontology was being phased out especially in light of the aging population. Professor Sedra noted that there was a graduate program in gerontology offered in the Faculty of Medicine.

Professor Hildyard explained that there was an increasing demand for spaces in the limited enrolment degree program in criminology. Those students interested in shorter programs could enrol in community colleges. With respect to the business certificate program, she said that although there were 64 students enrolled in the program only 13 graduated per year. There was a tendency for students to take some courses and then not continue. The College was discussing new ideas with the Rotman School of Management. Professor Sedra added that the School of Continuing Studies also offered a number of courses in business.

Dean Amrhein said that the Faculty of Arts and Science was developing a program in health and public policy. This might lead to the development of a program in gerontology.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the following Woodsworth College programs be discontinued:

Certificate Program in Business
Certificate Program in Criminology
Certificate Program in Law Enforcement and Administration, and
Diploma Program in Gerontology.

The motion was carried unanimously.

(b) School of Graduate Studies - M.H.Sc. Program in Clinical Biochemistry

Professor McCammond introduced the proposal to discontinue the M.H.Sc. program in clinical biochemistry in the Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology. This decision, taken following an internal review, was based on the academic reasons laid out in Professor McCammond's memorandum to the Committee, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "E". Average enrolment over the past five years had been 15 students. Total loss of tuition revenue would be about \$65,000 but the Department had recently increased its doctoral enrolment and planned to give priority to the M.Sc. and Ph.D. programs.

7. **Discontinuation of Programs** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the M.H.Sc. program in Clinical Biochemistry in the Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology be discontinued.

The motion was carried unanimously.

8. **Budget: Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations**

The Chair explained that the Committee's role was to recommend on proposed expenditures from the Academic Priorities Fund. These recommendations were based on recently completed academic divisional plans.

Professor Sedra was pleased to introduce the first group of academic plans and the resulting proposals for allocations arising from the *Raising Our Sights* planning process. He said that, in general, the process had been a good one. *Raising Our Sights* had been endorsed by the Governing Council on January 21, 1999. Academic divisions had been expected to submit their plans by October 31, 1999. In his view, the process of plan development had been both inclusive and consultative. Some of the plans had been received by the end of October, others had taken longer to draft. Then followed discussions between the individual principals and deans and his Office about their plans and the consequent A.P.F. allocations. In September, Professor Sedra expected to bring forward the plans from the health science divisions including Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy and Dentistry; the plans for the colleges, OISE/UT and Management would be brought forward in October.

There had been three elements to the planning process: self study, external review and plan development. Professor Sedra noted that there had been some skepticism at the beginning that the process would be time-consuming and elaborate. He believed, however, that most divisions had found the process useful. The feedback from the external reviews had been illuminating although it tended to have fewer critical remarks than might be expected. The systematic process had allowed divisions to develop benchmarks that they could use to compare themselves to other universities. The plans looked forward for the next four years. In general, Professor Sedra said that he was pleased with the results although there had been less strategic planning than he had expected. He had attempted to rectify this problem in consultation with the deans. Having good academic plans helped the University to be able to respond quickly to various opportunities - in applying for funding from the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund, in responding to the Canada Research Chairs Program, and in setting priorities for the fundraising campaign.

Professor Sedra explained that the Academic Priorities Fund or A.P.F. was the tool used to help implement the plans. The A.P.F. was derived from two sources. The first was a reallocative levy to the academic divisions and the academic services such as the library and computing divisions of 1.5 percent per year for four years. On a budget of \$352 million, this produced an amount of \$22.7 million. The second source of base money was revenue from tuition fee increases. Thirty percent of this increased revenue must be used for student aid. Sixty-five percent of the remainder, approximately \$10.3 million, was added to the A.P.F. for a total of \$33 million to be distributed over the four-year period 2000 to 2004. The other 35 percent of the revenue net of the portion for student aid went to the operating budget's bottom line. The source of the one-time-only (OTO) funds was the portion of the base A.P.F. money not used in a given year. This carryforward amount had been between \$3 - 5 million a year, yielding

8. Budget: Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

an estimated \$16 million in OTO funds over the four-year period. Professor Sedra noted there was also \$3.7 million available in the Academic Transition Fund (A.T.F.) over the same period.

At April 30, 2000, there had been an unallocated balance of \$1.4 million in the A.P.F. Professor Sedra explained that it had been used to “top-up” the salaries of new faculty. The standard starting salary of \$58,500 had been exceeded in many areas. He had asked the divisions to provide one third of the “top-up” costs while the centre had used \$1.1 million from the A.P.F. for the remaining portion.

In making the recommendations, Professor Sedra noted that revenue sharing from the tuition fee income had been notionally taken into account in the case of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering but not for the Faculty of Arts and Science. Similarly, quality enhancement funding from the Access to Opportunities Program (ATOP) was also part of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering recommendation but, again, not in the Faculty of Arts and Science. There was, therefore, some unfinished business with respect to the allocations. He noted that in total, the base budgets of the faculties whose plans were being presented now accounted for 50 percent of the relevant base budget of the academic divisions but only 40 percent of the available funding in the A.P.F. was being recommended for allocation.

The motion was duly moved and seconded and the plans and allocations for the individual divisions were discussed. Attached hereto as Appendix “F” is the executive summary of each division’s plan and the summary table of funding requests and recommended allocations.

A member asked for a table showing which divisions provided how much of the \$10.3 million of the revenue-sharing funds arising from the tuition fee increases. Professor Sedra undertook to provide the data for the next meeting. Another member suggested that it would be useful to know what the relevant base budget of each division was. This information was provided as each plan was discussed.

a) Faculty of Arts and Science

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$111.2 million
Proposed Allocation: \$8.0 million in base, \$4.1 million OTO

Professor Sedra briefly reviewed the planning process and plan for the Faculty. He said that the process had been very consultative and that he was pleased with the degree of engagement. The Faculty planned to take its reallocation cut (1.5 percent per year for 4 years) through retirements. Through the planning process, which had included external reviews of groups of disciplines or clusters, the Faculty had decided where new appointments would be needed to strengthen its programs and research. There were a number of instances where the Faculty was working with the professional faculties to enrich liberal arts programs with work in a professional discipline. Professor Sedra expressed concern that there had not been more emphasis on graduate enrolment planning. Indeed, only the Faculty of Music had drafted a graduate enrolment plan. He was recommending that the Faculty of Arts and Science receive \$8 million in the form of a funding envelope, \$7 million of which was targeted for 90 FTE positions based on a starting salary of \$65,000 plus benefits. The remainder of the base funding would be used for administrative positions, technical staff, teaching assistants (TAs), and the writing initiative. An allocation of \$4.1 million OTO was recommended for such items as student space, laboratory equipment, computing facilities and the in-fill capital project for Sidney Smith Hall.

A member noted that her division had been looking at additional support for TAs and she was pleased to see the support provided to the Faculty of Arts and Science. She asked whether graduate planning was something that should be done. Professor Sedra encouraged the

8. Budget: Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

University of Toronto at Scarborough to look at graduate planning and at TA support. He reminded members of the Report of the Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support which had reviewed graduate student support issues. He knew that graduate planning over three campuses was difficult but it was also very important.

In response to a question, Dean Amrhein indicated that the new appointments, before the possible appointments provided through the Canada Research Chairs program were taken into account, would not change appreciably the current distribution of teaching staff among the four divisional areas: Humanities, Social Sciences, Physical Sciences and Life Sciences.

A member noted the funding proposed for laboratory equipment and commented that finding funding for the replacement of old equipment was a wide-spread issue. He asked if there was a general strategy. Professor Sedra agreed that it was an issue but setting aside funding was a balancing act. He said that the University could use twice as much funding as it had available. Both the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering had given priority to equipment renewal. The member suggested that good equipment and sufficient study space were two components of improving student experience. Professor Sedra agreed and said that he was relying on the principals and deans to make the choices about funding needs.

A member recalled that several years ago the Faculty had received an allocation for a travel fund. Professor Sedra noted that the present request was to add that funding to the base. During the course of consultations with the Dean on the give and take of what was funded, the Dean agreed to continue to fund travel from Faculty resources while the Provost provided funding for other initiatives.

In response to a question about the Botany greenhouses, Dean Amrhein explained that they were to be moved as part of a change to accommodate the new Pharmacy building, a project that had garnered funding from the SuperBuild program. The Centre would be erected on the northwest corner of College Street and University Avenue/Queen's Park Crescent. The Department of Botany had been wanting for some time to move the greenhouses closer to its space in the Earth Sciences Centre.

Professor Sedra commented that allocations arising from ATOP funding and from revenue sharing from the tuition fees would come to the Committee at a later date. In answer to a question, Professor Sedra recalled that an allocation for graduate student aid had been made in the budget. An amount of \$9.4 million over the four-year period had been set aside.

b) Centre for Comparative Literature

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$560,000
Proposed Allocation: \$98,000 in base, \$10,000 OTO

Centre for Medieval Studies

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$1 million
Proposed Allocation: \$159,640 in base, \$157,680 OTO

Professor Sedra explained that both these centres had recently moved administratively from the School of Graduate Studies to the Faculty of Arts and Science. Both were outstanding, mature centres whose teaching staff were mostly from departments within the Faculty of Arts and Science although the Centre for Medieval Studies included teaching staff from Music and the Pontifical Institute for Medieval Studies. Allocations for other institutes and centres would be presented at future meetings.

8. Budget: Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

c) Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$30.0 million

Proposed Allocation: \$3.33 million in base, \$1.65 million OTO

Professor Sedra commented that the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering had taken the planning exercise extremely seriously and, as a result of the first planning exercise, had had a good list of results on which to base the next one. The undergraduate enrolment had grown because of ATOP and the quality of entering students was extremely high. The huge demand for graduates of the undergraduate program and the faster graduating rates of those in the graduate programs had led to a decrease in graduate enrolment. The Faculty planned to return to a level of 1200 graduate students. Recently, the Faculty had received an extraordinary gift from Mr. Ted Rogers which would provide funds for graduate student aid, among other things. The total amount of research funding now exceeded the base operating budget. The original request for funding had been to restore the appointments that had been lost. This notion was considered antithetical to strategic planning and Professor Sedra had drafted a number of principles that had guided the decisions for allocations in the Faculty. Funding was being recommended for 22 academic positions and 12 administrative positions, for TA support, for equipment upgrades and for the language across the curriculum program, as well as a number of other initiatives. Revenue sharing funding had also been recommended for program quality enhancements.

Dean Charles said that the Faculty's plan was ambitious so that it could take its place as one of the best engineering faculties in the world. There had been an evolution through the early 1994 plan to the second one in 1998 and now the present plan to grow selectively and strengthen its programs. He noted that some revenue sharing funding had been received but there would be a further distribution later in the fall.

In response to a question, Professor Sedra confirmed that the Faculty of Arts and Science would also receive further funding in the fall arising from the revenue sharing funds. Distribution of funding from ATOP was complicated and took time. He intended to recommend allocation of more of the revenue sharing funds when the Faculty of Medicine and other health sciences faculties' plans came forward at the next meeting.

A member asked for an explanation of the revenue sharing funds. Professor Sedra explained that the revenue sharing funds were derived from that portion of the tuition fee increase in deregulated programs that was greater than the increase in the fees for regulated programs. If the regulated program fees rose three percent and a particular deregulated fee rose five percent, the revenue represented by the two percent difference would be placed in a pot. Thirty percent of all such revenue must be reinvested in student aid. Of the remaining amount, 65 percent formed the revenue sharing part of the A.P.F. and 35 percent went to the bottom line of the operating budget to benefit all divisions. That 65 percent was available to be redistributed to the divisions. Professor McCammond confirmed that there was no formula that would ensure that a Faculty received the same amount of funding as their tuition fees had contributed to the revenue sharing fund. Professor Sedra indicated that the funds in the student aid budget were not targeted for particular programs although students in programs with higher tuition fees would be eligible for more student aid under the University's guarantee of support.

A member noted that the request for funding for the Registrar's Office in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering had been deferred. Would the Faculty be able to resubmit a request at a later date? Professor Sedra replied affirmatively. He also noted that requests for development support would also be dealt with later in the process.

8. Budget: Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

d) Faculty of Social Work

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$3.1 million
Proposed Allocation: \$181,250 in base, \$60,000 OTO

Professor Sedra explained that the external review of the Faculty had been very helpful since it had shown both the Faculty's strengths and its weaknesses. The Faculty had plans to improve its M.S.W. program in terms of core content, standardized courses and credit hours. The Faculty had been very successful in its fundraising campaign, having reached 85 percent of its \$18.5 million campaign. Six chairs had been funded. In terms of APF support, Professor Sedra had recommended support for two academic positions, funding for doctoral student support, and OTO funding to support an electronic classroom.

Dean Shera said that part of the planning process had been to consider performance indicators and to benchmark the Faculty against the top schools in the United States. It had ranked well especially in the fundraising and endowment categories. He expressed his pleasure with the exercise and noted that research and scholarly activity was improving. The number of endowed chairs had helped maintain the Faculty's complement. The ratio of tenure/tenure-stream appointments to sessional appointment was still a problem; however, he hoped the Canada Research Chairs program would provide an opportunity to address that issue.

A member noted that the Anti-racism, Multiculturalism and Native Issues (AMNI) Centre was much discussed but no allocation was sought or provided. Dean Shera noted that there was an endowed chair in multiculturalism which would support the program and he added that there was contract research support rather than grant support for the Centre. The Faculty was still intending to raise \$500,000 in support of the Centre.

e) Faculty of Music

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$6.1 million
Proposed Allocation: \$416,825 in base, \$600,000 OTO

Professor Sedra recalled that the Faculty's previous plan had not been considered until 1997 because of the appointment of the new Dean. He said that Dean Beach's leadership had made a huge difference to the Faculty. Its plan at this time was to continue in the direction described in its original plan: there would be a shift in enrolment from undergraduate to graduate. The opera program and the Ph.D. in musicology were considered the best in Canada. The Faculty had raised funding for three endowed chairs. Professor Sedra was particularly pleased that the Faculty had engaged in a graduate planning exercise. He was recommending funding for four academic positions and an upgrade of a part-time position to full time. The Faculty would also receive funding for administrative staff and for an increase in its graduate fellowship budget.

Dean Beach noted that the Faculty had just completed fundraising for its fourth endowed chair.

A member recalled that the Faculty had been in trouble several years ago but was now poised to become a top flight Music faculty. Professor Sedra said that it was due to Dean Beach's leadership. Before he joined the Faculty there had been dissension. Now the emphasis was on research and the academic programs.

8. Budget: Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

f) Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$3.2 million

Proposed Allocation: \$396,894 in base, \$836,363 OTO

Professor Sedra said that this Faculty too had benefited from new leadership. The previous plan, completed after Dean Richards joined the Faculty in 1997, proposed transforming its professional programs from undergraduate to graduate ones. New master's programs in Architecture and Landscape Architecture had been implemented. The Faculty was also collaborating with the Faculty of Arts and Science to offer a program that was a mix of liberal arts and professional education. The master's programs were doing well and the bachelor's program (in Arts and Science) was experiencing greater enrolment than planned. Planning for a doctoral program was underway. The Faculty's requests had been quite ambitious but a balance was struck and it was proposed that it receive funding for three academic positions and some support for administrative staff and TAs. Professor Sedra noted that the building housing the Faculty was in dire need of repair. It was proposed that the University continue to match any funding raised for the renovations.

Dean Richards noted that the Faculty was slightly behind in its schedule to roll out new programs. This fall, the new Master's in Urban Design would be implemented. The Faculty expected to have a doctoral program by 2002. He said that the building was 92 years old and in need of \$9 million in renovations. The Faculty had made some progress in improving the computing infrastructure. The bachelor of arts program in architectural studies was four times over enrolled which was proving a strain on resources. He hoped to be able to provide additional support to the program.

g) Faculty of Forestry

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$1.9 million

Proposed Allocation: \$171,250 in base, 25,000 OTO

Professor Sedra that the Faculty of Forestry had been transformed from a mixed undergraduate and graduate school to a solely graduate enterprise. It offered a research-based master's and doctoral program and the professional Master of Forest Conservation Program. He said that the reviews of the Faculty had been very helpful. The Faculty was planning to offer, in collaboration with the Faculty of Arts and Science, a bachelor's program in forest conservation. There were also plans for new master's programs in wood engineering and forest policy and trade analysis. Professor Sedra proposed that the Faculty receive funding for an academic position, an administrative position and TA support. OTO funding was proposed for computing facilities. He said that the Faculty was in good shape under the leadership of Dean Bryan.

Professor Timmer recalled that the Faculty had survived the traumatic time when it had discontinued its undergraduate programs. Planning had helped the Faculty to shape itself into something completely different. He noted that the Faculty had raised funds for an endowed chair. All the graduates of its master's program in forest conservation were finding jobs and enrolment was good. The Faculty had an opportunity to return to undergraduate teaching through the proposed program with the Faculty of Arts and Science.

A member asked whether the decision to close the undergraduate programs had been wrong. Professor Timmer commented that while he regretted that the faculty complement had been reduced, the Faculty was pleased that the decision had given it an opportunity to move into new fields.

8. Budget: Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

h) Transitional Year Program

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$846,000
Proposed Allocation: \$171,250 in base

Professor Sedra commented that offering this program was one of the most successful things this University did. It was a program which gave students - who would otherwise not come to University - a chance to prepare for entrance to university study. The Program was thriving under the leadership of Professor Abramovitch. Professor Sedra recommended funding for the addition of one tenure-stream position and a 0.3 FTE appointment. T.Y.P. had been exempt from budget reductions and funding was proposed to offset operating costs currently supported from trust funds.

In response to questions, Professor Sedra said that T.Y.P. students attracted 0.7 BIUs. The tenure-stream appointment would be held in OISE/UT.

i) Ethnocultural Academic Initiatives Fund)

Proposed Allocation: \$600,000 OTO

Professor Sedra indicated that this program had been operating since 1992 with support averaging \$75,000 per annum from the A.P.F. Proposals were submitted and funded on the basis of a competition, with the winning projects reported to the Academic Board for information. It was proposed that the annual allocation be increased to \$150,000 to include the support of a visiting scholar program.

In response to a question, Professor Sedra said that the visiting scholar might be on campus for three to six months. It was not proposed that the professorship develop into a tenure-stream appointment. Professor Tuohy said that it would be important to consider a number of options for the visiting scholar program.

j) International Student Exchange Office

Proposed Allocation: \$145,000 in base

Professor Sedra stated that the allocation proposed for the Office would allow the appropriate staffing and programming in the area of international student exchange. The Office had produced a strategic plan which was available for review from the Provost's Office. He noted that the director reported to the Vice-Provost, Students.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the following allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund be made in support of divisional plans, 2000-2004:

	Base	OTO
Arts & Science	\$8,000,000	\$4,100,000
Comparative Literature	98,000	10,000
Medieval Studies	159,640	157,680
Engineering	3,332,712	1,650,000
Social Work	181,250	60,000

8. **Budget: Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations** (cont'd)

	Base	OTO
Music	416,825	600,000
Architecture	396,894	836,363
Forestry	172,188	25,000
TYP	171,250	
Ethnocultural Academic Initiatives Fund		600,000
International Student Exchange Office	145,000	
Total	Base: \$13,073,759	OTO: \$8,039,043

The motion was passed unanimously.

9. **Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair noted that the next meeting would be held on Wednesday September 13th, 2000.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

August 9, 2000