

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 65 OF
THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE

November 14, 2000

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Wednesday, October 18, 2000 at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Professor David Mock (In the Chair)
Professor Ronald D. Venter (Vice-Chair)
Dr. Robert J. Birgeneau, President
Professor Adel S. Sedra,
Vice-President and Provost
Professor Michael Finlayson, Vice-
President, Administration and Human
Resources
Professor Derek McCammond,
Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget
Professor Carl Amrhein
Professor W. Raymond Cummins
Professor Ruth M. Gallop
Professor Avrum I. Gotlieb
Professor Angela Hildyard
Professor Bruce Kidd

Professor Robert H. McNutt
Mr. Fayez A. Queresby
Professor Nancy Reid
Professor Kenneth Sevcik
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones
Professor Fred Wilson
Professor Linda Wilson-Pauwels

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy Provost

Secretariat:

Ms Susan Girard
Ms Margaret McKone

Regrets:

Mr. Muhammad Basil Ahmad
Mr. Brian C. Burchell
Mr. Brian Davis
Professor Michael Finlayson
Mr. Ljupco Gjorgjinski

Professor Susan Horton

In Attendance:

Professor Michael Charles, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor Gail Donner, Dean, Faculty of Nursing
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant Provost
Professor Wayne Hindmarsh, Dean, Faculty of Pharmacy
Dr. David Naylor, Dean, Faculty of Medicine
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost, Students
Miss Janice Oliver, Assistant Vice-President, Operations and Services
Ms Carol Robb, Assistant Vice-Provost, Health Sciences
Professor Barry Sessle, Dean, Faculty of Dentistry
Ms Lynn Snowden, Assistant Vice-Provost, Arts and Science

THE MEETING WAS HELD IN OPEN SESSION. ITEMS ARE
RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting - Report Number 64 (October 18, 2000)

Report Number 64 was placed on the table. The Chair said that it would be considered at the next meeting.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

Item 7. Capital Project: Users' Committee Report - University of Toronto Schools
and OISE/UT at 371 Bloor Street West

The Chair noted that on page 15, second full paragraph, a member had asked for a report on the relationship between the University of Toronto Schools (UTS) and OISE/UT. Professor Sedra had taken the member's suggestion under advisement and undertook to report at this meeting. Professor Sedra said that he had asked Dean Fullan to attend the Academic Board meeting in two days' time to address this issue.

3. Vary the Agenda

The Chair noted that Dean Naylor had a 6 p.m. commitment and would have to leave the meeting at that time. He asked that the Committee agree to vary the agenda to consider the Academic Priorities Fund allocations immediately following the senior assessor's report. The Committee agreed without dissent.

4. Senior Assessor's Report

The Provost reported on the following matters.

(a) Maclean's Ranking

Professor Sedra was pleased to report that the Maclean's survey had ranked the University number one among the medical/doctoral universities in Canada for the seventh year in a row.

(b) Enrolment Expansion

Professor Sedra reported on where the University currently was in its negotiations with the provincial government with respect to enrolment expansion. The University was considering expanding at the low end of the range detailed in the Framework for Enrolment Expansion, approved by Governing Council last academic year. The new level was 9,000 students, of which the University was already committed to taking 4,000 through the Access to Opportunities Program (ATOP). The remaining 5,000 students would mean a 50 percent expansion of both the University of Toronto at Mississauga (U.T.M.) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (U.T.Sc.). Expansion continued to be subject to the government's providing the necessary capital funding. The latter statement had caused some concern in the government and the University had agreed to modify its statement to explain that it would expand its enrolment and that it was working with the government to find the necessary capital fund for expansion. Professor Sedra believed it was the same substance in the message but a different presentation. The government found it more congenial and it allayed the anxiety in prospective students and their parents. He said that the University firmly believed that there would be the necessary capital funds for expansion. The funds might not be provided through the SuperBuild program but rather through different arrangements.

The University had begun planning in a preliminary way at U.T.M. and U.T.Sc. with the involvement of the Faculty of Arts and Science. Programs at the graduate level would remain unified and the planning must be integrated. He hope to have a preliminary plan for discussion in January. He wanted to assure the Board that if the newspapers reported in a slightly different manner, the basic concepts remained unchanged.

A member asked whether there had been any change in the University's position on appropriate operating support for expansion. Professor Sedra said that there had not been any change; all universities wanted full average funding of all new students rather than incremental funding. The government had not yet responded. There was some concern about the lack of dialogue.

(c) Canada Research Chairs

Professor Sedra recalled that in September, the University had submitted nominations for 40 Canada Research Chairs (C.R.C.) and would add six or seven more names in December to exceed slightly the 45-chair limit for the first year. This was not a matter of concern as it meant the funds would flow until the second year of the program. Letters would soon be sent to all deans about the C.R.C. program and the clusters and chairs that would come under their jurisdiction, the breakdown between tier 1 and tier 2 chairs and whether they were internal or external appointees. He expected some iteration with the deans and then preparations would begin for next year's nominations.

A member understood that a large proportion of the first set of nominations were for internal candidates. He asked what the University expected when it began to recruit new faculty. Professor Sedra agreed that the vast majority of nominations were of internal faculty members. He expected the same across the country. The final plan was to have one third of the chairs held by internal faculty and two thirds held by new faculty. The competition for faculty would be stiff.

5. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations

The Chair welcomed the deans who were in attendance for this item.

He explained that the Committee's role was to recommend approval of expenditures from the Academic Priorities Fund. These recommendations were based on recently completed academic divisional plans. At its July meeting, the Committee had considered similar plans for several other academic divisions including the faculties of Faculty of Arts and Science, Applied Science and Engineering, Social Work, Music, Architecture, Landscape, and Design, Forestry and the Transitional Year Program.

Professor Sedra said that this was the second batch of academic plans with recommended allocations that the Committee would be considering. The group included four health science faculties - Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy and Nursing - as well as the School of Graduate Studies (S.G.S.), the division of student recruitment and an allocation for U.T.M. The allocations for the latter two divisions were proposed pending the consideration of their full academic plans. In July, he had outlined the process. He did not propose to do that again but instead referred members to the July memorandum, a copy of which had been included in the agenda package.

With respect to the health sciences in general, Professor Sedra said that the University was blessed with a terrific group of faculties. Without the wonderful health sciences complex in the City of Toronto, the health sciences would not be as strong. The extensive interaction between the two boded well for the future of the health science disciplines at the University.

He believed that the most exiting breakthroughs in the next 25 years would be in the life and health sciences. The University was well placed to contribute to exciting research in the coming years.

He referred to Table 1 attached to his covering memorandum. This table would help members keep track of the relevant base budgets of the divisions and their recommended allocations. He hoped to bring forward recommendations for the remainder of the divisions at the next meeting of the Committee. Finally, he noted that the summaries of these academic plans were fuller than those provided in July. They gave a very good picture of where each faculty was at this time and he hoped the members would find the information helpful and useful.

Documentation for this item is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

a) Faculty of Medicine

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$53.9 million
Proposed Allocation: \$3,285,250 in base, \$2,320,720 OTO

Continuing his general remarks about the health sciences, Professor Sedra commented that the Faculty of Medicine had considerable intellectual richness and the scope and breadth of its disciplines ranked it with the top schools in the world.

The Faculty, under the leadership of Dr. Naylor, had taken the planning process under *Raising Our Sights* very seriously. He had put together a process and a plan that took advantage of the Faculty's strengths. Professor Sedra noted that although the Faculty was very complex, the plan was very clearly explained in three volumes. Members who wished to see the full text could do so in the Governing Council Offices. The Faculty's proposal were well conceived and very reasonable in magnitude. As a result, he had agreed to most of the requests.

Dr. Naylor thanked the Committee for accommodating his schedule. He thanked Professor Sedra for his comments and explained that about 200 people had been involved in drafting the plan. The proposals for A.P.F. involved interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary and inter-Faculty collaboration.

A member referred to the section in the documentation on *Review of Reviews: Recommendations and Concerns*. One of the areas of concern was student support, particularly the areas of housing and personal and financial counselling. He asked how the Faculty planned to address these issues. Dean Naylor said that the Faculty was in the throes of a detailed review of this area and was contemplating creating registrarial services and financial counselling. He suggested the work around the new Task Force on Investing in Students might be helpful in approaching this issue. He hoped to have a report in the next few weeks. With respect to student aid, he said that increasing tuition fees were causing pressure in this area. The Faculty had rebuilt its relationship with the alumni association and the association was increasing its fundraising activities. The Faculty was also requesting additional support for its development office. The key priorities here would be to raise funding for the capital needs of the Faculty and for student financial support. The development office and the alumni association would be working together. Professor Sedra noted that the priorities in the Campaign were set, based on the priorities of the academic divisions. He recalled that there were exciting plans for the Varsity Stadium site to include residences and the health sciences had asked that one of the modules on that site be allocated to them.

In response to a question about a review of the undergraduate curriculum, Dean Naylor said that the process was underway. It had been actively discussed by the departmental chairs. It would be a laborious and political process involving many faculty and students and nothing

would happen quickly. There would also be accreditation issues in the background. Issues to be addressed would include increasing the basic science content, changing the style of teaching and evaluating problem-based learning.

A member asked about the source of matching funds for endowed chairs. Professor Sedra indicated that the funding did not come from the A.P.F. but rather from the I'Anson Fund, which still had some funding available. Dean Naylor noted that there were 45 chairs held jointly with the hospitals and that the funds for those chairs were held in the hospitals.

b) Faculty of Dentistry

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$14.7 million

Proposed Allocation: \$400,003 in base, \$878,750 million OTO

Professor Sedra explained that this Faculty was one of two in the province; the Faculty at the University of Western Ontario was much smaller. One of the important thing this Faculty had done in the past was to find creative ways to increase revenue rather than reduce expenditures when faced with budget reductions. The new initiatives included the introduction of the side-by-side program and, most recently, the qualifying program. The Faculty had been given considerable support from the centre to implement the new initiatives. Professor Sedra said that the academic plan was an exciting one. He wished to underscore several points. The two tenure-stream faculty positions being recommended were in addition to the CRC chairs the Faculty would be assigned. There would be a net increase in the Faculty's complement of four positions. He had also recommended approval of two junior positions on an OTO basis for four years. These appointees would be given time off to work on their Ph.D.s. These appointment would be reviewed in three years, and if the program has been successful, the funding would become part of the base. The request for administrative support had been deferred. Dean Sessle or his successor would be reviewing the administrative structure and a report would be forthcoming.

Dean Sessle noted that, similar to the process in the Faculty of Medicine, the process in his Faculty had been a bottom-up process. Several working groups composed of staff and students provided input into a committee which drafted the final academic plan. The central theme was to enhance the educational experience of students by improving student services including mentoring and financial counselling, improving teaching and professional development of faculty members, and introducing innovative programs at the graduate level.

A member asked if there were any unresolved accreditation issues, what the ranking of the Faculty was in North America, whether the demand for dentists could support two schools in Ontario, what the comparative position was with Western and what was the condition of the equipment in the clinic. In response, Dean Sessle reported that the undergraduate program had been fully accredited about one year ago and was now set for five to seven years. The Faculty was the only one in Canada to be accredited in all specializations. Two programs had been required to report progress on several issues. An O.C.G.S. review at the graduate level had been extensive and produced a good review. With respect to ranking, Toronto's was the only dental school in Canada to offer graduate training in all nine specializations, it was tops in terms of research funding and received two or three times more funding than the others. He believed it would rank in the top 5 - 10 in North America. The Western program was no longer a separate Faculty but it had been combined with Medicine and its future was unclear. The age of the clinic facilities was still a concern. The graduate clinic had been renovated but the junior clinic remained a challenge for him and his successor. Some progress had been made but it was an expensive undertaking. Some funding had been obtained to upgrade the pre-clinical facilities but the real challenge was the teaching areas.

A member noted the plans to continue the program in the summer months and she asked about the availability of faculty members. Professor Sedra explained that the workload would remain the same but it would be rearranged. Dean Sessle noted that there had been a request for administrative staff support which was being delayed. Another member asked about the students' response to summer courses. Dean Sessle explained that it was a response to a student request to enhance the clinical experience. They were very supportive. The member noted that it would shorten the time the student could expect to earn funding for the next year. Professor Tuohy said that this would be taken into account in the needs assessment under the student aid packages.

A member asked about the difficulty of attracting international students to the Faculty's program. Dean Sessle said that there had been 16 places for visa students in the side-by-side program. Several years ago, the government had mandated that the program be phased out. It had been replaced with the qualifying program. This program had not yet developed its reputation. Professor Sedra also noted that in other countries, dentistry was not a second-entry program. There were difficulties but some ideas were being discussed. It was still a major bargain for American students.

c) Faculty of Pharmacy

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$4.7 million

Proposed Allocation: \$284,726 in base, \$110,000 OTO

Professor Sedra said that the Faculty's plan called for expanded enrolment levels in the bachelor's of science in pharmacy program. When the program was first entry, there were 160 students enrolled. This dropped to 120 when the program became second entry. The program was now experiencing a huge demand from students and employers. It was the only one in the province. The University believed that unless it undertook to expand, there might be new faculties created which might not be in the best interests of the tax payers. The proposal, therefore was to double enrolment to 240 students. In the context of enrolment expansion plans, a further doubling of the enrolment to 480 students was part of the 4,000 student enrolment expansion to which the University was committed. The University has received the capital funding necessary to build a new building to house the expanded Faculty at the corner of College Street and University Avenue. The Faculty's academic plan was commendable and he supported it in principle. However, there because there had been no announcement from the government on operating funding for the 480 students, he was recommending only a partial response at this time to fund the expansion to 240 students. He believed the full expansion would happen and he proposed to keep the Faculty in excellent shape for future expansion. There would be an allocation from the Enrolment Growth Fund. Another component of the plan was the new bachelor of pharmaceutical science, to be offered in conjunction with the Faculty of Arts and Science and the University of Toronto at Mississauga. Professor Sedra said that the proposal was an exciting one and he supported it in principle. He hoped to obtain funding for it through normal enrolment funding and he noted that the proposal have been presented informally to the government.

Dean Hindmarsh explained that the strategic plan had been drafted with input from faculty, students and support staff. He was envious of the help available from the large number of faculty in Medicine - in Pharmacy, there were 20 faculty members. There was great enthusiasm for the plan from faculty and staff, and some apprehension concerning a doubling of enrolment. The larger Faculty would mean a greater presence on campus in addition to strengthened research endeavours and quality of programs. A recent accreditation process had concluded that the Faculty was one of the best programs in Canada and probably North America. The Faculty was committed to maintaining its quality while growing. He wished the whole plan could be supported now but he understood the need to wait.

A member asked Professor Sedra to expand on his point about the possibility of a second school in the province. Professor Sedra indicated that there was a proposal from Queen's University for a program in pharmacy. Another member understood that this University had already been given funding for capital expansion. Professor Sedra said that this point was raised with the government in talks concerning the provision of operating funds.

A member asked about using foreign pharmacists to meet the need. Dean Hindmarsh said that taking in foreign-trained pharmacists was not part of the plan. However, the Faculty did receive seed money to hire someone to coordinate a program for foreign-trained pharmacists to ensure the same competency as the Faculty's graduating students. A proposal was being prepared for submission to the government, perhaps using the qualifying program in dentistry as a model. There was a tremendous shortage of pharmacists in Canada and there were major recruitment drives from the United States.

A member asked about plans for distance education in this area. Dean Hindmarsh commented that the Faculty was working on its first course, which it hoped to have ready by next fall. There were a number of such programs in the U.S. and the Faculty was in contact with them. There were only two Faculties of Pharmacy in the country, here and U.B.C.

Dean Amrhein said that the process of planning a program involving two faculties had been enjoyable and had proceeded smoothly. Professor Sedra added that the proposed degree would be offered by the Faculty of Arts and Science.

d) Faculty of Nursing

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$3.5 million

Proposed Allocation: \$594,341 in base, \$201,500 OTO

Professor Sedra commented that there was a lot of activity in the nursing profession in Ontario. The provincial government has changed the requirements in order to practice and all nurses now need a bachelor's degree. A number of collaborative programs have been established between the community colleges and universities. This University has decided not to enter into such an arrangement. It has, instead, decided to focus on the second major need and that is for producing the graduates who would become the faculty in other programs. This University and McMaster University were the only two to offer Ph.D. programs in nursing in Ontario. A joint proposal would be submitted to the government to support an expansion of the master's and doctoral programs at the two universities. It made little sense to cause expansion at the other faculties of nursing. It would be best to concentrate resources in areas of strength and current doctoral activity. By and large, the Faculty of Nursing was a graduate faculty. It offered a unique, second-entry, two-year undergraduate degree which graduated 30 students per year. There was a possibility to expand at the undergraduate level if appropriate government funding was provided but the strength of the Faculty was truly impressive at the graduate level. The academic plan was an ambitious one and was predicated on expanding the graduate operation. The Faculty was waiting to hear from the government concerning its joint proposal with McMaster. Until that response was received, Professor Sedra supported the plan's direction and had proposed to provide funding to maintain the strength in the faculty complement and for increased administrative support.

Dean Donner was thankful that the Faculty had not become embroiled in the activity surrounding the establishment of collaborative programs with community colleges; that process was apparently time-consuming. There appeared to be some chaos in the field of nursing concerning the impending shortage of nurses. The Faculty instead had focused its plan to capitalize on its strengths to prepare educators, expert practitioners and researchers.

Although the Faculty was small, there had been a fairly participatory process in which consensus had been built around the future direction of the Faculty. She hoped the University would recruit an excellent new dean to take charge of the plan. Professor Sedra thanked Dean Donner for her leadership over the past eighteen months. He noted that this plan and that of Pharmacy would be revisited once the government's position was known.

In response to a member's questions, Dean Donner said that the bachelor's program would only double in size if appropriate additional government funding was provided. There would be no expansion without funding. With respect to the applicants to the program, Dean Donner said that at least two years of university study were required but 90 percent of the applicants had completed a degree. They currently had 300 applicants for the 30 places for next year.

e) School of Graduate Studies

(i) Centres and Institutes

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$6.2 million

Proposed Allocation: \$355,944 in base, \$1,508,000 OTO

(ii) Administration

Relevant Base Budget 2000: \$3.0 million

Proposed Allocation: \$209,930 in base, \$365,122 OTO

Professor Sedra explained that the School of Graduate Studies (S.G.S.) had two roles. The first was to administer all graduate programs in the University. The budget for this administrative part was approximately \$3 million. The second role was to administer the centres and institutes and to facilitate collaborative programs. The budget for this task was just over \$6 million. S.G.S. has drafted two plans and each had generated an administrative response.

Centres and Institutes

Professor Sedra commented that the School had adopted a very good policy with respect to centres and institutes. Its role would be to establish the units and provide support during an "incubation" period. If the units were interdisciplinary, then they would stay a part of S.G.S. However, if the centre or institute was functioning entirely within a division, the School would consider divesting it. Last year, the Centre for Comparative Literature and the Centre for Medieval Studies had both moved to the Faculty of Arts and Science and were now administered by that Faculty. Both centres were given A.P.F. allocations in conjunction with the Faculty of Arts and Science's plan. The allocations proposed for the centres and institutes vary according to the needs of each. For example, the allocation for the Centre for Russian and East European Studies would support the administration of the summer internship program. Almost all the recommended allocations fit a particular need and each would make a huge difference to the individual centre or institute. In aggregate, the allocations would make a contribution to the interdisciplinary programs at the University.

Dean Marrus noted that there was a "life cycle" for some of the centres and institutes. They were born in S.G.S. because they were different in some respect and did not fit into one of the faculties. Every university dealt with the same question of where to place its interdisciplinary centres and institutes. He believed the answer was that the best place for these units varied at different stages of their development. The challenge was drafting an academic plans for them. The Joint Centre for Asia-Pacific Studies was one example. It was a joint program with York University. Its director was stepping down and a mandated review was underway which would determine what was best for the University at this stage in the

Centre's life. The second example was the Graduate Centre for Study of Drama. This was the best time to look at the Centre's future as it was undergoing an O.C.G.S. review. The interface between graduate and undergraduate study of drama would be explored. The undergraduate program at University College would be part of the review and it was hoped that out of the process would come a new course and new role for the Centre. There was constant interchange between the parties as the plans mature. Principal McNutt hoped that the faculty at U.T.M. would be involved in the drama discussions.

A member agreed that S.G.S. provided a valuable resource as a way to start things at the graduate level that might otherwise not have been established. He noted that there was not a similar mechanism at the undergraduate level. On a second point, he recalled that the planning document of several years ago suggested that the graduate activity at S.G.S. be transferred to the academic divisions. He wondered why that administrative transfer had not been completed. Professor Sedra commented that there were, indeed, a number of cross-disciplinary undergraduate programs. Another member noted that there was a powerful role for colleges in the creation and nurture of such programs, particularly in the humanities. He mentioned the aboriginal studies program and cinema studies, each located in a particular college. Professor Sedra agreed that the University needed undergraduate programs that crossed faculty boundaries. At present, there was not a good mechanism for encouraging such programs. He hoped that the new undergraduate education council being established by the President would play a positive role in this area.

A member noted that resources had been requested by the Centre for Criminology and the Centre for Industrial Relations to teach statistics. She hoped that the Department of Statistics would be consulted. Professor Sedra said that the request had raised a concern which he hoped could be resolved in consultation between the centres and the Department.

Administration

Professor Sedra recall that there had been major changes planned for the School, namely, that it would devolve its graduate activity to the divisions. At that time, a compromise had been reached in which it did devolve a good number of functions to the divisions but it remained as an independent faculty with a changed mandate. Management of the U of T open scholarship program would devolve to the divisions this year. The School would continue to provide financial counselling to graduate students and would turn its attention to institutional-wide initiatives such as the Office of Graduate Education Research and the Office of English Language Writing Skills. These were valuable functions and showed that the School was moving toward a role as facilitator and advocate of graduate work.

Dean Marrus recalled that several times a year he met with his counterparts from the research-intensive universities in Canada and the United States. He said that their titles were a good indication of where the graduate school fit into the University. For example, one was a graduate dean of arts and science and another was a graduate dean an vice-provost research and international relations. S.G.S. was close to completing the devolution of activities to the divisions and was moving away from the administration of rules. It was free to concentrate on making creative changes to improve the quality of graduate education. His job as dean was to make this model work well and he felt energized by the possibilities. He did not know if the graduate felt the same way. Some of the programs he was working on included distance education in nursing, English language education initiatives, a report on post-doctoral studies and financial counselling.

A member agreed that the new role for S.G.S. suited it better than that of policeman. The allocation to support the writing skills office was very important. This was serious issue at both the graduate and undergraduate level. Professor Sedra indicated that Dr. Margaret

Proctor from the UC Writing Workshop, had been involved in the process that lead to this proposal.

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
Dentistry	\$400,003	\$878,750
Medicine	3,285,250	2,320,720
Nursing	594,341	201,500
Pharmacy	284,726	110,000
SGS		
- Centres and Institutes	355,944	1,508,000
- Inst. For Women's & Gender Studies (New College)	50,000	
- Administration	209,930	365,122
Student Recruitment	600,000	25,000
UofT at Mississauga		850,000
Total	\$5,780,284	\$6,234,092

6. Budget: Enrolment Growth Fund - Allocations

The Chair noted that continuing members would recall the establishment of this fund to provide allocations to divisions in support of enrolment increases under approved agreements. Revenues generated from enrolment increases in the B.Ed. program and Computer Science and high-demand areas in Engineering under ATOP are directed to the fund as prescribed by the Long-Range Budget Guidelines.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

The following allocations from the Enrolment Growth Fund, subject to the divisions meeting the increased enrolment targets:

1. To OISE/UT for expenses associated with the B.Ed. Program; One-Time-Only (OTO) funding of \$720,000 in each of 2000-01, 2001-02 and 2002-03.
2. To the University of Toronto at Mississauga for the Master of Biotechnology Program; \$213,196 in base funding.

3. To the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering for expenses associated with ATOP expansion in engineering programs; \$4,639,676 in base funding.
 4. To the Faculty of Arts and Science for expenses associated with ATOP expansion in engineering programs; \$519,275 in base funding.
 5. To Facilities and Services for operating costs associated with the Bahen Centre for Information Technology; \$469,980 in base funding.
7. **Ontario Superbuild Renewal Program/Ontario Facility Renewal Fund/
Accommodation and Facilities Directorate Infrastructure Plan for 2000-01**

Professor McCammond noted that this

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT Schedule A to Professor McCammond's memorandum of October 26, 2000, for allocations totaling \$12,062,110 be recommended for approval as the University's SFP/OFRF/AFD Infrastructure Plan for 2000-01. Projects funded from the OFRD are to be implemented upon confirmation of funding.

8. **Budget: Academic Transitional Fund - Allocations**

The Chair said that the Committee recommended allocations from this Fund which was contained in the Budget. The Academic Transitional Fund was a sinking fund created to support initiatives to help decrease costs or increase divisional income.

Professor McCammond introduced the proposal

9. **Physical Accessibility to Buildings - Status Report**

The Chair reported that the administration had undertaken to provide this report in response to concerns raised earlier in the year. The Report was provided for members' information.

10. Academic Units and Programs: Resource Allocations

The Chair explained that programs within a particular degree were primarily handled through the curriculum approval process of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. The administration brought the resource aspects of these programs to this Committee for consideration only if they involved allocation of central University resources, significant shifts in divisional resources and/or significant implications for other divisions, institutions or the public. Where program changes reviewed by AP&P did not require a recommendation to the Planning and Budget Committee, the administration documented the basis on which this decision had been made and reported to this Committee for information.

The Committee received an account, for information, from the administration concerning several such programs:

- School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a New Master's (M.A.Sc.) and Ph.D. Program in Biomedical Engineering
- School of Graduate Studies: Ph.D. Program in Management -- New Field in Accounting
- School of Graduate Studies: Master's of Social Work (M.S.W.) Program -- Curriculum Changes

11. Capital Project: Users' Committee - Upgrade of Level 3 Research Facilities - Terms of Reference**12. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members of the next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, December 12, 2000 at 5:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at p.m.

Secretary

Chair

December 5th, 2000