

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 Tuesday, November 14, 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 Assessor:

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 5, 6, 7 and 8 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

(a) 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 had undertaken 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 6:00 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 subject to the provision of operating funds. 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 at U.T.M. and U.T.Sc. continued to be subject to the government's providing the necessary capital funding. However, rather than stating this as a condition, the University was currently saying that expansion would take place and that the University was working with the government to find the necessary capital funds. Professor Sedra believed it was the same substance in the message but a different presentation. The government found this expression of capital requirement more congenial and it allayed the anxiety in prospective students and their parents. He said that the University 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.

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

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 would necessarily be integrated. He hoped to have a preliminary plan for discussion in January.

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 for 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. 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 was for internal candidates. He asked what the University expected when it began to recruit new faculty. Professor Sedra agreed that the vast majority of the initial nominations were of internal faculty members. He expected the same across the country. The University's 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.

The Chair 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 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.) and the division of student recruitment. An OTO allocation for the University of Toronto at Mississauga was also proposed pending the consideration of its full academic plan. 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 at the University 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 exciting breakthroughs in the next 25

5. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

years would be in the life and health sciences. The University was well placed to contribute to this research in the coming years.

Professor Sedra 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 most of the remaining divisions at the next meeting of the Committee. Finally, he noted that the summaries of these academic plans were quite full and that they gave a very good picture of where each faculty was at this time. He hoped the members would find the information helpful.

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 medical schools in the world.

The Faculty, under the leadership of Dean 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 Office. The Faculty's proposals 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. funding 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

5. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

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 things 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 innovative one. He wished to underscore several points. The two tenure-stream faculty positions being recommended were in addition to the C.R.C. 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 appointments would be reviewed in three years, and if the program has been successful, the funding would become part of the base in the next academic plan. 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 had 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 Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (O.C.G.S.) review at the graduate level had been extensive and had produced a good review. With respect to ranking, the University of 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 to 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

5. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

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 clinical 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 the proposal was in fact in 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 program.

A member asked about the difficulty of attracting international students to the Faculty's programs. 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 of science in pharmacy program. When the program had been a first-entry one, there had been 160 students enrolled per year. This had 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 taxpayers. The proposal, therefore, was to double enrolment to 240 students per year. The University had received the capital funding necessary to construct 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. He was recommending only a partial response at this time to fund the recent increase in enrolment from 120 to 140 through an allocation from the Enrolment Growth Fund. Because Pharmacy was planning for enrolment expansion, Professor Sedra was also recommending that its base budget reduction be offset by an A.P.F. allocation. He believed enrolment doubling would happen and he proposed to keep the Faculty in excellent shape for this expansion. 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 as part of the University's enrolment expansion plans.

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

5. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

strengthened research endeavours and quality of programs. A recent accreditation process had concluded that the Faculty offered 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 was correct and the point was raised with the government in talks concerning the provision of operating funds.

A member asked about using foreign pharmacists to meet the demand. 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 the Pharm.D. program. Dean Hindmarsh commented that the Faculty was working on its first course, which it hoped to have ready by next fall. There were only two Pharm.D. programs in the country, here and the University of British Columbia.

Dean Amrhein said that the process of planning the new bachelor of pharmaceutical science program involving the two faculties (Arts and Science and Pharmacy) had been enjoyable and had proceeded smoothly. Professor Sedra added that the Faculty of Arts and Science would offer the proposed degree.

(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 were a lot of changes in nursing education in Ontario. The provincial government had changed the requirements for entry into practice and all nurses now would require a bachelor's degree. A number of collaborative programs had been established between the community colleges and universities. This University had decided not to enter into such an arrangement. It had, instead, decided to focus on the second major need and that was 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 had been submitted to the government to support an expansion of the master's and doctoral programs at the two universities. It made little sense to expand graduate education at the other faculties of nursing. Rather, 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

5. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

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. The Faculty instead had focused its plan to capitalize on its strengths to prepare educators, nursing leaders 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 oversee the administration of 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. had drafted two plans and each had generated an administrative response.

(i) 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 interdivisional, 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 had been given A.P.F. allocations in conjunction with the Faculty of Arts and Science's plan. The allocations proposed for the centres and institutes varied 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 pressing need and each would make a

5. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

large difference to the individual centre or institute. In aggregate, the allocations would make a contribution to 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 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 matured. 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 interdisciplinary work 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 had 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. On the issue of devolving responsibility for the administration of graduate programs, Professor Sedra referred the member to the report contained in the S.G.S. plan.

A member noted that S.G.S. had requested resources 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.

(ii) Administration

Professor Sedra recalled that there had been major changes planned for the School, namely, that it would devolve a number of activities to the divisions. At that time, a compromise had been reached in which the School did devolve a good number of functions to the divisions but it remained as an independent faculty with a changed mandate. Management of the University of Toronto Open Fellowship 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 institution-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.

5. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

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 and 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. 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 a 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 led to this proposal.

(f) Student Recruitment

Relevant Base Budget 2000:	\$900,000
Proposed Allocation:	\$600,000 in base (\$300,000 in 2000-01 and \$300,000 in 2001-02)

Professor Orchard commented that *Raising Our Sights* had reasserted the University's goal of recruiting and supporting outstanding students. With the appointment of a Director of Student Recruitment in November 1998, the University had strengthened the infrastructure necessary for an ongoing active recruitment campaign. The Director had developed a recruitment strategy and plan in consultation with recruitment staff in the divisions, Principals and Deans, the Recruitment Campaign Council and the senior administration of the University.

A member noted that the number of international students had declined in the last decade and he asked about the University's overall goal for international enrolment. Professor Orchard noted that the number of international undergraduate students had increased in 1998 by 34.5% and again in 1999 by a further 86.6%. Similarly, at the graduate level, international graduate student numbers had increased by 10.7% in 1998 and a further 29.6% in 1999. It was hoped that international enrolment could be further increased.

(g) University of Toronto at Mississauga

Relevant Base Budget 2000:	\$31.1 million (includes \$2 million for physical plant)
Proposed Allocation:	\$850,000 OTO

Professor Sedra noted that the University of Toronto at Mississauga's plan 2004 had been delayed pending clarification of terms on which the expansion might occur on the suburban campuses. In the meanwhile, there were a number of urgent infrastructure needs, for upgrade and replacement of instructional equipment, for web development and for upgrade of equipment that was part of the aging physical plant of the College.

Professor McNutt drew specific attention to the recommended allocations in support of grounds maintenance and physical accessibility initiatives, noting that there was need to upgrade many of the campus' facilities. Also, impending retirements would force the College to rely to a greater extent on stipendiary teaching.

5. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations (cont'd)

A member congratulated the College on the number of buildings that were accessible. Those accessibility initiatives for which funding was sought pertained only to automatic door openers, adjustable computer desks and accessible service desks.

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	
UofT at Mississauga		850,000
Total	\$5,780,284	\$6,234,092

THAT an allocation also be made to the Faculty of Pharmacy in support of its Raising Our Sights Plan from the Enrolment Growth Fund to recognize the additional costs associated with the increase in enrolment from 120 students to 140 students in the B.Sc. Pharm.

	Base	OTO
Pharmacy	\$287,483	\$50,000

6. Budget: Enrolment Growth Fund - Allocations

Professor McCammond recalled that the Enrolment Growth Fund had been established to fund divisions for enrolment increases under approved agreements. In particular, revenue generated by the enrolment increases in the B.Ed. program and Commuter Science and high-demand areas in Engineering under the Access to Opportunities Program (ATOP) initiative had been flowed to the fund as prescribed in the *Long-Range Budget Guidelines and Projections 1998 - 2004*. Funding for an increase of 94 students in the B.Ed enrolment and an interim allocation for the ATOP enrolment increase had been approved in October, 1999. The proposed allocation currently before members provided funding for an additional 94 B.Ed. students and the remaining base funding available to resource the steady state ATOP enrolment increase in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering. It also provided funding for the new Master of Biotechnology program at the University of Toronto at Mississauga. An allocation to resource the steady state ATOP enrolment increase in computer science programs would be brought to a future Planning and Budget Committee meeting.

Professor McCammond continued that the proposed allocations would provide funding for additional faculty, administrative and technical staff, increased teaching assistant assignments,

6. Budget: Enrolment Growth Fund - Allocations (cont'd)

laboratory equipment and general operating expenses necessary to accommodate the increased enrolment in the B.Ed., the Master of Biotechnology and Engineering programs. A total of \$5,372,147 in base funding and \$720,000 OTO per year for three years was being allocated to the Faculties of Applied Science and Engineering, Arts and Science and OISE/UT as well as to the University of Toronto at Mississauga. A further \$469,980 was being allocated to the Facilities and Services Department for the operating costs of the New Bahen Centre for Information Technology, which would house the ATOP enrolment increase.

Professor McCammond drew members' attention to his revised memorandum, dated October 26, 2000, which had been placed on the table.

Professor McCammond responded to a number of questions for clarification. During the course of the discussion, Professor McCammond clarified the following proposed allocations.

Allocation to OISE/UT for expenses associated with the B.Ed. Program. An allocation had been made to the OISE/UT in October, 1999 for an increase of 94 students enrolled in the B.Ed. program in 1999-2000 and subsequent years. The proposed allocation was for a further increase of 94 students starting 2000-01 (for a total of 188 students). OISE/UT had proposed to teach the extra 94 students in four extra classes. The \$720,000 would be used to fund extra instructors (\$614,000); supplies and practice teaching expenses (\$65,000); and other indirect expenses (\$41,000). The proposed allocation was for annual one-time-only funding but was assured only until 2002-03.

Professor Sedra commented that unlike ATOP funding, which was for base allocations, the government had allocated only one-time-only funds to the University for this enrolment increase. The increased funding had sought to increase the number of graduates from OISE/UT to help assist the current shortage of teachers in the province. Presumably, this shortage would be remedied by 2002-03.

A member commented negatively on the government's short-term enrolment strategy.

Allocation to the University of Toronto at Mississauga for the new Master of Biotechnology Program. The operating costs of this program were being resourced by an allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund of \$100,000 for three years (previously approved by the Governing Council) and revenue generated by the tuition fees which would flow to the Enrolment Growth Fund. The program had a target enrolment of fifty students by 2003-04. The funding would be used for teaching stipends, administrative and laboratory staff, teaching assistants and general operating costs.

Allocation to the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering for expenses associated with ATOP enrolment increases in Engineering Programs. The planned steady state undergraduate enrolment increase resulting from the ATOP initiative for the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering in 2004-05 over its 1997-98 enrolment was 701. An increase of 108 graduate students was also planned. The increased teaching and supervisory loads were concentrated in the Departments of Electrical and Computer Engineering and Mechanical and Industrial Engineering. The proposed base allocation provided funding for faculty, administrative and technical staff, teaching assistants, laboratory and general operating expenses.

An interim allocation of \$998,323 in base funding had been approved in October, 1999 and the proposed allocation provided the remaining base funding available to resource the steady state ATOP enrolment increase in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering.

6. Budget: Enrolment Growth Fund - Allocations (cont'd)

Allocation to the Faculty of Arts and Science for expenses associated with ATOP enrolment increases in Engineering Programs. This allocation recognized the instructional contribution made by the Faculty of Arts and Science to students enrolled in undergraduate engineering programs and the increased requirements resulting from the ATOP enrolment increase. The Faculty would be using the funding for new faculty, teaching resources and teaching assistants.

Allocation to Facilities and Services towards the operating costs of the Bahen Centre for Information Technology (BCIT). The teaching facilities, faculty offices, research laboratories etc. associated with the ATOP enrolment increase would be housed in the BCIT. Operating costs for space had been included in the ATOP budget.

Allocation of increased tuition fee revenues to financial aid. Professor McCammond clarified that 30 percent of the revenue realized from tuition fee increases was allocated towards financial aid programs. 65 percent of the revenue from the tuition fee increases in excess of the percentage fee increase for the regulated programs, net of the required 30 percent directed to financial aid, flowed to the Academic Priorities Fund, to be allocated for program improvement and quality enhancement, and to the Faculty Retention Fund.

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.

The Chair noted that the motion had been carried unanimously.

**7. Ontario Superbuild Renewal Program/Ontario Facility Renewal Fund/
Accommodation and Facilities Directorate Infrastructure Plan for 2000-01**

The Chair noted that there was some urgency to implementing the projects contained within the infrastructure plan and, therefore, if it enjoyed the support of the Planning and Budget Committee at today's meeting, it would be fast-tracked to the Academic Board at its meeting later in the week. The remaining recommendations of the Planning and Budget Committee would be forwarded to the January 11, 2001 meeting of the Academic Board.

7. **Ontario Superbuild Renewal Program/Ontario Facility Renewal Fund/
Accommodation and Facilities Directorate Infrastructure Plan for 2000-01** (cont'd)

Professor McCammond noted that the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate (AFD) had again combined the University of Toronto's share of the government's funding for facilities renewal with university funding to develop an integrated facilities renewal program. The following sources of funding were available:

- 2000-01 SuperBuild Renewal Fund (SRP);
- 2000-01 Ontario Facilities Renewal Fund (OFRP);
- AFD's Operating Budget for 2000-01, plus prior year project savings; and
- Additional funding contributed by divisions towards specific projects.

Total funding available was \$12,062,100 (including \$270,010 of divisional funding). Of the remainder, \$789,200 was AFD's Operating Budget for 2000-01 plus prior year project savings, \$5,730,000 from the new SuperBuild Renewal Program and \$5,272,900 from the Ontario Facilities Renewal Fund.

Professor McCammond noted that representatives of AFD had met during the summer to prioritize the University's needs for infrastructure renewal, classroom upgrades, disabled access and space alterations and modernization. Divisions had been invited to submit projects for review and prioritization by AFD. The recommendations that had been brought forward represented a combination of AFD's own initial review and divisional funding priorities.

Professor McCammond's memorandum outlined the various projects to be undertaken at the federated and affiliated institutions, the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses, and the St. George campus.

Discussion ensued on the following aspects of the plan.

Federated and affiliated institutions. In response to a member's questions, Professor McCammond clarified that funding for these institutions arose from the same criteria used to allocated funding between the Ontario universities. For the Ontario Facilities Renewal Fund, this was an allocation based on the Council of Ontario Universities' *Building Blocks* space formula. Funds from the SuperBuild Renewal Program were allocated based on student enrolment. In addition, the Faculty of Arts and Science had been asked to include in their submission to the committee projects which could be located in the Federated Colleges, and would improve the condition and efficiency of existing academic teaching and research facilities. Two such projects had been included on the schedule of recommended projects.

Library and student activity space initiatives. A member spoke in support of the recommended allocation to Robarts Library and asked if future initiatives would include student activity space. Professor McCammond responded that such initiatives did not meet the eligibility requirements for COU space formula. The University was seeking to provide increased space for student activities, including 21 Sussex Avenue.

Accessibility projects. It was noted that two projects with a combined funding allocation of \$387,000 from the SuperBuild Renewal Program were recommended. The first was a wheelchair access project at the Architecture building at a cost of \$260,000. The second was the provision of a disabled access for OISE/UT at 45 Walmer Road at a cost of \$118,000. In addition to these the AFD operating budget and the Students' Administrative Council would each contribute \$30,000 for a total budget of \$60,000 to be used for a variety of accessibility projects.

7. **Ontario Superbuild Renewal Program/Ontario Facility Renewal Fund/
Accommodation and Facilities Directorate Infrastructure Plan for 2000-01** (cont'd)

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 SRP/OFRF/AFD Infrastructure Plan for 2000-01. Projects funded from the OFRD are to be implemented upon confirmation of funding.

The Chair noted that the motion had been carried unanimously.

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

Professor Sedra noted that the Planning and Budget Committee recommended allocations from the Academic Transitional Fund (A.T.F.), a sinking fund created to support initiatives to help decrease costs or increase divisional income. A summary of the allocations to date for support of divisional *Raising Our Sights* plans was appended to his introductory memorandum.

During the course of the discussion, Professor Sedra noted that the fund had \$3.7 million available for allocation to 2002. It had originally been funded through monies budgeted for the employer's contributions to the pension fund that were not necessary because the pension fund was in a surplus and from a Long-Term Disability insurance rebate.

Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design: Information Technology Design Centre. In response to members' questions, Professor Sedra clarified that the Faculty was seeking \$177,300 to cover costs associated with the phasing out of the Information Technology Design Centre. The Centre had been established eight years ago as a self-funded unit to offer a Continuing Education Certificate Program. The unit had not generated the kind of revenue that had originally been anticipated. In the Faculty's plan 2004, it had been proposed that the Centre be phased out by July 31, 2000 given that there were now numerous external competing institutions, and student enrolment in the Centre had fallen. The unit had been closed in July, 2000. However, the Faculty now faced a deficit of \$177,300 associated with the phase-out. In terms of hardware, software and technical computing support, the Centre had benefited the Faculty. Its remaining resources would be folded into the Faculty's graduate programs. It was therefore proposed that the costs associated with the closure of the unit be funded from the Academic Transitional Fund.

Dean Wright elaborated that in its efforts to keep the Centre going, the highest-level technical equipment had been purchased. This had driven up the costs of operating the Centre. Competition had arisen when Sheridan College had also entered the field. Finally, as the fees for the program had increased, the Faculty had lost many of its constituencies. He agreed with the Provost's wisdom that this was not an area in which the Faculty could continue.

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

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the following allocations from the Academic Transitional Fund be approved:

- \$120,000 to the Faculty of Arts and Science for the purchase of Micro-Scale Equipment by the Department of Chemistry;
- \$125,000 to the University of Toronto at Mississauga to finance the construction of a centre to house the Masters in Biotechnology; and
- \$177,300 to the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design for the phase-out of the Information Technology Design Centre.

9. Physical Accessibility to Buildings - Status Report

Professor Sedra recalled that the administration had undertaken to provide this report in response to concerns raised earlier in the year. The Report was now being provided for members' information.

In response to members' suggestions, Miss Oliver undertook to expand the scope of the report to include the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses, both of which were very accessible.

A member asked what provisions were in place should a student who required an accessible classroom be enrolled in a class that was located in one of the non-accessible locations. Miss Oliver and Dean Amhrein responded that in such instances the class was relocated to an accessible location. A Handicapped Access database had been set up to respond to requests to book accessible public space including classrooms, examinations, libraries and teaching laboratories.

A member commented that many of the buildings on the St. George campus would become fully accessible with the installation of an automatic door on at least one building entrance. He urged that these projects be given priority. Miss Oliver responded that the Accessibility Working Group would be consulting with the Students' Administrative Council with regard to a prioritized list.

Members commented that the report was very useful. In response to members' suggestions, Professor Sedra undertook to bring back an updated report to the Planning and Budget Committee on an annual basis.

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 the Planning and Budget 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 the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs 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 the Planning and Budget Committee for information.

10. Academic Units and Programs: Resource Allocations (cont'd)

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

The Committee received for information a copy of the terms of reference and membership for a users' committee to upgrade the University's Level 3 Research Facility, housed at the Medical Sciences Building. In this facility, research involving biohazardous agents was conducted. Health Canada had advised that the Facility required upgrading to enable faculty to carry out research involving airborne pathogens. The committee was to report by January 30, 2001.

12. Date of Next Meeting

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Secretary
January 4, 2001

Chair