

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 59 OF**  
**THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**

**March 7, 2000**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, March 7, at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Professor David Mock (In the Chair)  
Professor Ronald Venter (Vice-Chair)  
Professor Adel S. Sedra,  
Vice-President and Provost  
Professor Derek McCammond,  
Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget  
Professor Carl Amrhein  
Dr. John Challis  
Professor Raymond Cummins  
Professor Ruth Gallop  
Professor Avrum Gotlieb  
Mr. Arvin Hariri  
Professor Susan Horton  
Professor Bruce Kidd  
Professor Michael Marrus  
Mr. Elan Ohayon  
Professor Paul Perron

Professor Nancy Reid  
Ms Wendy Talfourd-Jones  
Professor Fred Wilson  
Ms Judith Wilson  
Mr. Vilko Zbogar

**Non-Voting Assessors:**

Professor Heather Munroe-Blum,  
Vice-President, Research and International  
Relations  
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy Provost

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Neil Dobbs  
Ms Margaret McKone

**Regrets:**

Mr. Brian Burchell  
Professor Michael Finlayson  
Ms Jacqueline Orange

**In Attendance:**

Professor Wendy Rolph, member of Governing Council, Chair, Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and Vice-Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Ms Sheila Brown, Controller and Director of Financial Services  
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council  
Dr. Beata FitzPatrick, Assistant Provost  
Professor Angela Hildyard, Principal, Woodsworth College  
Ms Manon LePaven, President, Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students  
Professor Roger Martin, Dean, Rotman School of Management  
Ms Mary McGee, Director, Enrolment Planning and Statistics  
Professor Robert McNutt, Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga

**In Attendance:** (cont'd)

Professor Ted Relp, Associate Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Mr. Paul Tsang, President, Graduate Students' Union  
Ms Mary-Ellen Yeomans, Assistant Dean and Chief Administrative Officer, Rotman School of Management

THE MEETING WAS HELD IN OPEN SESSION. ITEMS 4, 6, 7 AND 8 CONTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS FOR APPROVAL.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report Number 58 was amended on page 3, Item 1, "Information Session: Resource Allocation, Planning and the Budget Approval Process." The fifth sentence, dealing with allocations from the Academic Priorities Fund, originally read, "Allocations for the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering had also been delayed owing to the postponement of the tuition increase to 1998-99." The final words of that sentence were corrected to read "to 1999-2000."

Report Number 58 (February 1, 2000), as amended, was approved.

The Chair noted that the Committee's Reports were now available on the Governing Council homepage. Members who might wish to revisit business of the Committee would be welcome, as always, to get in touch with the Committee Secretary, or to retrieve the information from the web at <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl>.

**2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting****Item 3(c) - Senior Assessor's Report: Teaching Assistants' Strike**

Professor Sedra reported that the cost of the 1999-2000 settlement with the union representing the teaching assistants was 2.75% of the teaching assistants' salary base, compared to the budgeted amount of 1.75%. On a base of \$15-million, the increased cost to the budget would be \$150,000. For the second year of the agreement, 2000-01, the cost of the settlement would be 2% of the relevant salary base compared to the budgeted 1.75%. The total added cost to the budget would be \$187,000.

**3. Senior Assessor's Report****(a) Research Activities**

At the invitation of the Provost, Professor Munroe-Blum reported on the recently announced federal budget, which she characterized as very welcome, both for the University of Toronto and for university research.

Among the key initiatives in the announcement was the federal government's commitment to funding 2,000 faculty chairs through its Canada Research Chairs program. Announced in last October's Throne Speech, the program was originally to support 1,200 chairs with another 800 to be funded at a later date. The government would commit \$300-million over five years for the full 2,000 chairs.

In addition, the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) infrastructure program had been extended by three years to 2005 and would have an additional \$900-million for research infrastructure needs. First proposed in 1997, the program had produced some 56 awards for the University and its affiliated teaching hospitals, for a total of \$75 million or approximately 15

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

per cent of CFI awards nationally. It was expected that some of this money would be allocated in support of research infrastructure start-up costs for the Canada Research Chairs. Other budget announcements had included an increase of \$2.5-billion in federal transfer payments to be earmarked for post-secondary education and health care. The University did not expect to benefit from this announcement directly as the provinces had since announced their intention to target this money for health care.

Finally, as part of its commitment to research, the government would allocate \$160-million to create the Genome Canada project. Five research centres were to be established across Canada and the University intended to compete vigorously for Ontario's centre.

There had been some disappointment that the federal budget had not included an increase in the allocation for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC); however, a subsequent allocation of \$10-million had been awarded. Professor Munroe-Blum commented that this was the first year in which the allocation had been increased for the SSHRC and not also for the Medical Research Council (MRC) and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC).

In response to a member's inquiry, Professor Munroe-Blum clarified the process for allocation of the Canada Research Chairs. The chairs were to be allocated in envelopes to institutions based on their faculty's performance with granting councils. The funds would then be competitively allocated within the institution. The University of Toronto received on average 14% of the support from the federal granting councils. The weighting of the chairs was to be slightly different than the norm (i.e. 45% of the weighting of the envelope received by the University of Toronto would come from NSERC, 20% from SSHRC, and the residual to the health sciences through the MRC and the Canadian Institutes for Health Research). Under debate was the possibility of a side stream within the program that would give an automatic entitlement of one chair or more to each university in Canada prior to the competitive allocation of chairs. The University was advocating that automatic entitlements be limited to 5% of the total envelope, as was the practice for the Canada Foundation for Innovation.

In response to further questions for clarification, Professor Munroe-Blum noted that she would report in further detail at the next meeting of the Committee, after the full terms of reference for the chairs had been developed and communicated.

Professor Sedra added that given past performance with the granting councils, it was hoped that this announcement would translate into approximately 285 chairs or \$40 - \$45-million of annual funding for the University of Toronto.

A member commented on two aspects of the budget that gave him cause for concern. First, he was concerned about accessibility. He recalled that in the previous budget there had been great optimism over the Millennium Scholarship Fund; however, the government would take some of these funds back as students were to be taxed on awards received. While there had been an increase in tax exemptions for scholarships in the current budget, there had been no positive announcements for students concerning tuition fees or disability issues. Second, there had been a serious erosion of base funding to post-secondary education, which had not been redressed in this announcement. The member asked what the University's response would be to these concerns.

Professor Munroe-Blum commented that the University had expressed its disappointment at the lack of a meaningful increase in the transfer for post-secondary education. The University was currently awaiting the provincial government's operating grant announcement. The University continued to lobby the government on these matters.

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

#### (b) **SuperBuild Growth Fund**

Professor Sedra reported that the University had enjoyed reasonable success in the first SuperBuild Growth Fund competition. A total of \$77.5-million had been awarded in support of the following 3 projects:

- \$28.8-million in support of the Health Sciences Complex, Phase 1 (this complex had two key components, the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research and the Centre for Health Sciences, a teaching and research facility that would house multi-faculty CFI funded research and accommodate an expanded Faculty of Pharmacy) – total project cost: \$120 million;
- \$24-million in support of the Centre for Information Technology (this project would house the ATOP expansion and a number of research projects) – total project cost: \$88-million;
- \$15.6-million in support of the initiative in Communication, Culture and Information Technology (CCIT) at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (Mississauga had proposed a new joint first-entry program with Sheridan College) – total project cost for the University site: \$24.7-million;
- \$9-million in indirect support of the Academic Resource Centre at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (the expansion of information technology facilities, including the provision of a major new smart classroom, was Scarborough's top capital priority) – total project cost: \$12-million. Funding was to be provided to Centennial College of Applied Arts and Technology, which would lease land on the University of Toronto campus.

A member noted that some of the projects were predicated on increased enrolment; however, the government had not yet announced its plan for funding the double cohort and demographic changes. Given that the University's position was that it would not increase enrolment without full funding support, the member wondered at what point the University could decide not to proceed with various projects, especially those on the Mississauga Campus. To date, the only funding announced for enrolment expansion had been that in support of the Access to Opportunities Program (ATOP). Professor Sedra responded that the above-listed projects were predicated on only minimal enrolment increases. The Centre for Information Technology had received funding from ATOP and, therefore, there was no uncertainty as to its funding. Funding for the Pharmacy building was predicated on a doubling of enrolment. Approximately 120 students per year graduated from the University's Faculty of Pharmacy, a number equal to approximately 30% of the number of new pharmacists required within the province each year. Given that the University offered the only pharmacy school in Ontario, it was crucial that the University expand its program. However, the Faculty of Pharmacy could not expand unless there was a commensurate increase in operating funds. On the Mississauga campus, the University's submission had anticipated an increase of 720 students in the new program. Again, this project was predicated on increased operating funds.

A member commented that the funding received from the SuperBuild Growth Fund for enrolment expansion was minimal compared to the expansion contemplated. This was especially true for the Scarborough campus, which was considering significant expansion. Professor Sedra noted that this competition of the SuperBuild Growth Fund was not the only source of funding for enrolment expansion. Unless considerably more funding was provided, none of the planned expansion would take place. He added that the capital funding for Scarborough from the SuperBuild Growth Fund was to provide facilities for enrolment growth already funded by ATOP.

**3. Senior Assessor's Report** (cont'd)**(c) Miscellaneous**

Professor Sedra noted that the government had not yet made an announcement concerning operating grants for universities and colleges for 2000-2001 or tuition fees. Therefore, the University's budget preparation had been delayed.

The Chair noted that once the funding announcements had been made, the Committee would begin its deliberation of next year's budget. Given the delay, there would be need to amend the Committee's meeting schedule.

**4. Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations – Joseph L. Rotman School of Management**

Professor Sedra said that the Rotman School of Management had been in transition for the past year or so and did not yet have an approved academic plan. It had submitted an ambitious plan to the Provost's Office, which would come forward to the Committee as a part of the *Raising our Sights* planning process. In the spring of 1999, the Committee had endorsed a recommendation of \$767,000 in one-time-only funding from the Academic Priorities Fund to pay the cost of quality enhancements in the MBA program. This funding had represented reinvestment of revenue that had arisen from the tuition-fee increase in the MBA program. Under usual circumstances, this funding would have been allocated as a base-budget increase. However, in the absence of an approved plan, the allocation had been one-time-only, as were the allocations to be considered by the Committee at this time.

Professor Sedra said that the Rotman School's plan was a bold one, involving major changes in faculty complement, program quality and size and services to students. Professor Sedra was discussing the plan with the Dean, but he was not yet ready to bring it forward with a recommendation for base-budget funding from the Academic Priorities Fund. In the meanwhile, the School had to pay the costs it had incurred in improving its program. Professor Sedra therefore recommended one-time-only funding again for the School. The first part of the recommendation, for \$767,410, simply continued the one-time-only funding previously approved for one further year. Once the School's plan was brought forward, it would become part of the base-budget funding allocation that would be recommended for the School. The second part of the recommendation, for a further \$413,563, was to provide funding required as a result of recruiting ten new faculty members to the School - a major achievement in an overheated market for faculty in the field of Management. The need for additional funding reflected the fact that the cost of the new recruits exceeded the current \$58,500 available in the budget of divisions to replace faculty members

Discussion focused on the following topics.

**(a) Funding for faculty salaries.** A member asked whether the salaries paid to the new appointees was representative of costs for faculty in the field of Management across North America. Invited to reply, Dean Martin said that it was representative of the salaries paid by the twenty five leading business schools. He reported that the School had succeeded in attracting many of its best prospects for the ten new appointments.

**(b) General appropriateness of the proposed allocation.** Although he generally supported proposals to increase funding for teaching, a member expressed a number of concerns about the proposal. Members had not been given a great deal of time to look into the merits of the proposal. This was problematic in that giving such short notice had happened previously. The proposal itself was problematic in that there were other needs that were more pressing. The Rotman School had already received over \$1-million in one-time-only funding as well as

4. **Academic Priorities Fund: Allocations – Joseph L. Rotman School of Management** (cont'd)

additional funding to match donations. It enjoyed one of the best buildings on Campus, while other buildings (such as the Borden Building) desperately needed general upgrading as well as renovations to make them accessible to all students. A part of the proposed funding was to upgrade computer equipment, but the Rotman School was already very well served, for example having electronic network outlets at every desk. While computer upgrades were highly desirable, other divisions were not able to afford them. Moreover, the question of computer upgrades was moot to some students (with disabilities) who could not even gain access to the building housing the computers. The Rotman School appeared to be receiving preferential treatment.

A member replied that the one of the previous member's arguments had been based on a false dichotomy. The largest part of the proposed recommendation was to cover the cost of faculty salaries. They had to be paid each year. It was therefore wrong to add up the one-time-only allocations for two or three years and say that the Rotman School would receive excessive funding. If the allocation had been in the usual form of a base-budget funding increase, the total would have been a much more modest one. A large part of the allocation would support faculty salaries. The salaries that were required to attract and retain the best faculty in Management - and in many other disciplines such as Economics, Medicine, Law and Computer Science - were high relative to others. That was, however, an unavoidable fact of the market for faculty in those areas. The only alternative to enabling those disciplines to pay the higher salaries required would be to cease hiring the best faculty and to tell students that they could not take courses in those areas from the best faculty. Equity was achieved by enabling all disciplines to hire the best faculty possible. Unfortunately, in some disciplines that required a higher level of spending than in others. It was not unreasonable to request funding for computer upgrades; computing equipment usually became obsolete in two years. It was also a false dichotomy to compare funding for teaching with funding for building renovations. The University did have a problem of deferred maintenance, which it was addressing as aggressively as possible using different funds and a separate allocation process.

Professor Sedra noted that a request for a series of one-time-only allocations could have been avoided if he had recommended a base-budget increase for the Rotman School of Management, comparable to the increases recommended for other divisions. There would then have been no need to bring this proposal to the Committee. However, the School did not yet have an approved plan. Therefore, out of respect for the Committee's process, Professor Sedra had submitted a second request for one-time-only funding for on-going costs. He recalled that fees for the MBA program had been increased, although not yet to an appropriate level. In other units, the Committee had agreed to base-budget increases for quality improvement generated by the increased revenue from tuition. In this case, the need for a renewed approval of one-time-only funding simply reflected the fact that the Rotman School of Management did not yet have an approved academic and budget plan. The Chair noted that the administration hoped to bring the School's plan to the Committee before the end of the Calendar year.

On the recommendation of the Vice-President and Provost,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

**THAT** the following allocations be made from the Academic Priorities Fund to the Rotman School of Management:  
\$767,410 OTO in support of quality enhancements; and  
\$413,563 OTO in support of new academic appointments.

**5. Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering / Joseph L. Rotman School of Management / School of Graduate Studies: Combined Jeffrey Skoll BASc/MBA Program – Establishment**

The Chair stated that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs recommended new programs within existing degrees. The resource aspects of new programs were brought to the Planning and Budget Committee if they involved the allocation of central University resources, significant shifts in divisional resources 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 submission to the Planning and Budget Committee, the administration documented the absence of resource implications and reported to the Committee for information. The Jeffrey Skoll Combined BASc/MBA Program was unique in that the resource implications had not yet been fully determined, given that the program was predicated on adding an additional section to the existing MBA program. The Provost had, however, agreed in principle with the introduction of the program and the extra MBA section. Later in the spring, he would address the resources required in his response to the Rotman School of Management's academic and budget plan. The administration had stated that should this Committee ultimately **not** endorse an allocation in support of the program, students could and would be accommodated within the existing MBA sections. The Chair suggested that the Committee agree to the proposal's being forwarded to the Academic Board for approval on this understanding.

Professor McCammond said that the Jeffrey Skoll Combined BASc/MBA Program would enable students to earn both their engineering and business administration degrees in one year's less time than students who complete the programs separately and sequentially. This would be possible because certain elective requirements for one program would be satisfied by courses taken in the other program. There would be significant resource implications: the need for an additional section of MBA courses. That requirement was included in the draft academic and budget plans of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering and of the Rotman School of Management, and the Provost had agreed to that aspect of the plans. If, however, the allocation required to implement this aspect of the plan were ultimately not approved, the fall-back would be that the students in this program would take their courses in the existing MBA program sections. The proposal was being brought forward in this unconventional way because the Program wished to select students for admission in June, 2000.

In response to a member's question, Professor Sedra said that the main resource implication was the cost of adding one section to the MBA program. That cost had not yet been determined.

Given that there were no resource implications, the Chair concluded that the proposal could go forward on the conditions outlined.

**6. A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto**

The Chair noted that members had before them a document entitled *Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto*, that arose from the discussion paper on enrolment expansion, which the Committee discussed at its November meeting. The *Framework* document addressed the most important challenge to face the Ontario university system in the coming decade – how to respond to the increasing demand for post-secondary education. The Planning and Budget Committee was responsible for policy on planning, which included enrolment plans and policies. If the Committee endorsed the *Framework* at today's meeting, it would be considered by the Academic Board at its meeting in two days' time. If it was endorsed by the Board, it would proceed to the Governing Council on April 6.

6. *A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto* (cont'd)

Professor Sedra said that he was very pleased to bring forward the *Framework* paper. It followed the discussion paper from November, 1999. The *Framework* document had been formulated in consultation with the Dean of Arts and Science and the Principals of the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses. It had been considered in numerous fora on all three campuses, including a discussion with Governors and various discussions with student and other campus groups. Discussions had also taken place in administrative fora, including the Principals and Deans and the group of Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs. A great deal of feedback had been received, leading to a number of modifications. The paper was now ready for consideration by and, Professor Sedra hoped, endorsement by governance. He stressed that the document was intended only to provide a framework. It was not a plan. It was designed to enable the University to respond to pressures to accept more enrolment. Professor Sedra did not anticipate that the Government would adopt a coherent funding plan to support expansion. Therefore, the Framework would be required to enable the University to respond in a planned and timely manner to individual pressures and opportunities as they arose.

Professor Tuohy presented the proposed *Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto*. A copy of her presentation is attached to Report Number 99 of the Academic Board as Appendix "E".

An extensive discussion ensued, including the following items.

**(a) Three-semester system.** A member asked about the impact of the proposed three-semester system on students. In particular, he asked whether students who might wish to restrict their studies, as many did currently, to the fall and winter terms would be required to enrol in courses in the summer session.

Dean Amrhein replied that the adoption of a semester system was an integral part of the package of changes, which included the elimination of the fifteen-credit degree. At the present time, the summer session served between 12,000 and 17,000 students each year. Nonetheless, the planning of course offerings and staffing proceeded entirely separately from the planning of winter session offerings. The objective of the semester system was not to make any change to the fall and winter-term offerings but rather to improve and stabilize summer-term course availability and to enable students to plan their course selection well in advance. This would be of particular importance for full-time students who might wish to complete their twenty-course degrees in three years by making use of summer courses; it would also benefit part-time students who made regular use of the summer term.

A member commented that adding a full-fledged summer term would mean very substantial cost increases. At the present time, various expensive courses were offered only once a year. It would be significantly more costly to offer those courses twice a year. While this might be affordable where the summer program was a large one, this would clearly not be the case at the University of Toronto at Mississauga, where the summer program was relatively small.

Professor Sedra agreed that it would be important to gauge carefully the added costs of expanding the summer term. He stressed that the three-semester system was intended for Arts and Science programs only. It was not planned to make a similar change for the professional faculties. It was clear that courses offered in the summer term would also be offered in the regular fall and winter terms. Professor Sedra stressed that it would be important to seek optimization of summer offerings to achieve the benefits of a three-semester system within an affordable cost structure. A member said he would have liked



6. *A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto* (cont'd)

the document to have included more detail about the expanded summer term.

**(b) Expansion and student services, student-activity space and student financial support.** A member noted that enrolment expansion should be accompanied by the expansion of student services and of space for student use. What would be the source of funds for the necessary expansion of student services and space? Professor Sedra replied that the enrolment-expansion framework assumed that the Government would fund all of the costs of expansion. In the absence of adequate funding, the University would not proceed with the proposed expansion. The member asked for the assurance that such expansion would not be funded from fee increases. Professor Sedra replied that the proposal did not assume fee increases beyond those that would take place in the absence of enrolment expansion. There would, of course, be increased revenue deriving from the higher number of students paying fees.

Professor McNutt agreed that additional funding for student services and facilities would be essential. Even at the present time, funding was insufficient. For example, the athletic facilities at the Mississauga campus were wholly inadequate, and Government policy did not permit the use of public funding for such facilities. In his view, that policy was short-sighted and the University should do everything possible to secure its reversal, especially in connection with the proposed enrolment expansion.

Another member expressed concern about the provision of adequate student financial aid to an expanded student body. Notwithstanding the University's guarantee that financial need would not prevent a student from beginning or continuing a program, many students already found that support was insufficient. In the member's opinion, the University was having trouble maintaining programs of support for its current enrolment. For example, the Faculty of Law might well reduce its debt-remission program. Moreover, students were emerging from their programs deeply in debt. The member would have liked to have seen references in the *Framework* document to such features as debt remission for an expanded enrolment.

The member commented that there was also need for consideration of improved transportation services and expanded housing.

**(c) University of Toronto Act.** A member asked whether the proposed major expansion would require amendments to the University of Toronto Act. Professor Sedra replied that the administration was monitoring the need for any changes to the Act that might arise; he hoped that there would be no need to open the Act.

**(d) Part-time student enrolment.** A member noted that part-time students currently made up about 25% of the University's "headcount" enrolment, and it was projected that this would continue to be the case. Was there a commitment to maintain part-time enrolment at that level? Professor Tuohy replied that the *Framework* document anticipated that there would be no change in the proportion of the University's enrolment by part-time students, provided that there was no further decline in demand for places from that category of students.

**(e) Expansion of co-operative programs at the University of Toronto at Scarborough.** A member voiced his support for the plan to expand co-operative education at the Scarborough campus. He noted, however, that there was an alternative - an internship year like the Professional Experience Year in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering - that was more cost effective. He commended that model for the consideration of the leaders of the University of Toronto at Scarborough.

**6. A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto** (cont'd)

Professor Sedra noted that the plan to extend the co-operative programs at the Scarborough campus would not prevent any other division from implementing a program like the Professional Experience Year in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering. The objective of the expansion of the Scarborough co-operative programs was to provide an opportunity for more students from the Greater Toronto Area who sought a co-operative university education, currently offered in Ontario only at the University of Waterloo, to obtain such an education in Toronto. Professor Sedra stressed that the proposal was not intended to replicate Waterloo programs such as engineering. The Scarborough programs would not be limited to technical areas. Rather, Scarborough intended to expand its current programs and possibly to add some new ones in non-technical areas.

Another member said that co-operative education was expensive. Economies of scale were not available; with more students there would be a need for more program coordinators. How would this increased cost be funded? Professor Sedra stressed again that no aspect of the proposed enrolment expansion would go forward in the absence of appropriate funding. In the case of cooperative programs, there were two possible sources. First, the Government of Ontario was attracted to programs, like cooperative programs, that were directly tied to employment prospects. Second, students in current co-operative education programs paid cost-recovery ancillary fees to meet the extra costs of such programs including assistance with job placements.

Invited to comment, Associate Principal Relph said that the University of Toronto at Scarborough fully supported the plan for expansion of co-operative education at Scarborough; it would be inclined to expand those programs even in the absence of enrolment expansion. Students in co-op programs currently accounted for 25% of enrolment at the campus. Professor Relph did caution that such an expansion would indeed involve additional costs. He noted that, even without expansion, there was a shortage of space for counsellors and coordinators.

**(f) Expansion and enrolment comparisons.** A member commented that the previous discussion paper on enrolment expansion provided comparisons to peer institutions, but those comparisons were limited to other North American universities. The member would have preferred broader comparisons to universities throughout the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). This would have been helpful given that access to universities in many OECD countries outside of North America was enhanced by a much lower level of tuition fees or even no tuition fees.

**(g) Multi-campus aspects of the proposal: location of programs.** A member referred to 10(d) of the report, which stated that "as the planning framework of *Raising our Sights* is applied at U.T.M., all programs will be reviewed and re-structured as appropriate in the context of expansion and to realize as fully as possible its distinctive strengths and to ensure that academic programs are appropriately situated across the three campuses." Did this indicate the possibility of moving programs among campuses? Professor Tuohy replied that within the *Raising our Sights* planning process, and making use of the flexibility provided by expansion, there might be room for program transfers. Dean Amrhein added that the Faculty of Arts and Science wished to ensure opportunities for undergraduates on each campus to participate in research. This would be facilitated by clusters of research strength on each campus. With differentiation, the faculty in a particular area on one campus might find that they were attracted to locate, and would be better able to contribute, on another. There was no list of disciplines or sub-disciplines intended for relocation. Any change would take place within the planning process, using any available flexibility to enable faculty members and groups to achieve their full potential.

6. *A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto* (cont'd)

Principal McNutt said that he supported the proposal, which would give the University of Toronto at Mississauga the opportunity for flexibility to achieve distinctive programs within the framework of the Faculty of Arts and Science. The Mississauga campus should not seek to match the programs on the St. George Campus, but it should seek to develop distinctive programs, which would include certain doctoral-stream and professional master's degree programs. Those strong, distinctive programs would allow each campus to attract top-rate students.

**(h) Multi-campus aspects of the proposal: graduate teaching.** A member noted that the proposal envisioned only 150 full-time-equivalent graduate students resident at each of the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses. That would amount to only one graduate student per faculty member.

Professor Sedra replied that the number 150 was merely an estimate derived by doubling the number of graduate students currently resident on those campuses. More important, that number did not represent the total number of graduate students who would be supervised by faculty from Mississauga and Scarborough. In many disciplines, they would supervise graduate students who were resident on the St. George Campus. Professor McNutt agreed with that interpretation. He noted that graduate students actually resident on the Mississauga campus were clustered in a number of disciplines that were particularly strong on that campus, for example Biological Science.

The member expressed concern that this would represent a prolongation, and extension to new faculty, of the current, highly unsatisfactory situation in which many Mississauga and Scarborough faculty members were forced to go to the St. George Campus to teach graduate students and then spent a large proportion of their time away from their home campuses.

Professor Sedra replied that the projection simply extrapolated from the current reality where Scarborough and Mississauga faculty members in many disciplines did in fact supervise their graduate students on the St. George Campus. Dean Amrhein added that graduate students in the Life Sciences, Psychology and Earth Sciences were often resident at the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses, working in their supervisors' laboratories. However, almost no students outside of those clusters, and virtually no students in the humanities and social sciences, were resident at the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses. This had long been a source of friction among the leaders of the campuses. This had also been a source of friction for many faculty members who thought that they should receive compensation for travel costs. The problem was that, apart from teaching assistantships, there were no opportunities to attract graduate students to take up residence at the Mississauga and Scarborough Campuses. One of the key objectives of the proposed enrolment-expansion framework was to enable the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses to identify and develop other clusters that would attract more graduate students to take up residence. The number of 150 graduate students on each of the campuses appeared to be within reach. The retention of opportunities for Mississauga and Scarborough faculty members in all disciplines to supervise graduate students would simply not be attainable if faculty were not permitted to perform their graduate supervision on the St. George Campus. The proposal was intended to represent the best realistic balance.

Professor McNutt noted that the number of 150 graduate students referred only to doctoral-stream students. Added to that number would be graduate students in professional masters degree programs. The member replied that the clear number in the proposal was 150 graduate students at each of the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses, and that number

**6. A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto** (cont'd)

was far too small. If the University wished to have excellent teaching and research take place on all campuses, it would not be permissible to have one class of faculty on one campus and another class on the others.

Professor Sedra replied that there was no question of different classes of faculty. The one immutable principle was that there be a single University of Toronto faculty adhering to a single, very high standard, with equal opportunity to participate in graduate teaching and research. The only question was: with enrolment expansion, would the University be able to succeed in developing other clusters - comparable to those in the Biological Sciences, Psychology and others now on the Mississauga and Scarborough Campuses - that would be able to attract graduate students to take up residence on those campuses? To date thriving academic clusters had been achieved in certain science areas but not in the humanities and social sciences.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, and carried with the necessary two-thirds majority, Mr. Tsang, President of the Graduate Students' Union, was invited to comment on this matter.\* He agreed with the member's concern about graduate supervision by Mississauga and Scarborough faculty members. If the University wished to expand its undergraduate enrolment on those campuses, it would clearly have to expand the faculty there, and new faculty members would wish to teach graduate students. To attract graduate students to be resident on those campuses, however, the University would have to engage in careful planning and active recruiting, and it would have to devote significant resources to providing on those campuses the facilities that graduate students would require. There was no intrinsic reason why graduate students in the humanities and social sciences could not be resident on the University of Toronto at Mississauga and at Scarborough, but to attract them, it would be necessary to provide improved library resources. It would also be necessary to provide such other infrastructure as graduate-student housing.

Dean Amrhein agreed completely. It had been understood throughout the consideration of the proposal that the conditions would have to be right to attract graduate students to the Mississauga and Scarborough Campuses.

**(i) Expansion of staff along with expanded enrolment.** A member asked what expansion of faculty and staff would take place to serve the proposed enrolment increase. Professor Sedra replied that at this time no specific numbers were planned. At the present time, the student to faculty ratio was about 20 to 1, and the University would want at least to replicate that ratio in a situation of expanded enrolment. It would similarly want to ensure replication of the current ratio of staff to faculty and students. The number of staff approximately equaled the number of faculty at the Mississauga and Scarborough campuses, which Professor Sedra thought were good examples.

**(j) Enrolment expansion and the proposal to discontinue the fifteen-credit degree.** In the course of discussion, a member said that the proposed framework for enrolment expansion appeared to depend upon the proposal to eliminate the fifteen-course degree - a

---

\* The Chair noted that the "Procedures for Non-Members to Address Governing Council, its Boards and Committees" provided that "requests from representative campus groups (e.g. . . .G.S.U. . . .) to address Governing Council or a board or committee [on a specific agenda item] normally will be granted by the appropriate chair." But, those procedures also stipulated that "the boards and committees should be approached in advance of meetings through their chairs, c/o the Governing Council Secretariat." Such an advance request had not been received. Therefore the Chair did not think it appropriate to use his authority to grant the request to speak but rather to invite a member to put a motion that Mr. Tsang be permitted to speak, which would require the agreement of two thirds of the Committee.

**6. A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto** (cont'd)

proposal that had not yet been considered by the Committee, much less endorsed by the Academic Board or approved by the Governing Council. There had been a number of references to the interdependence of the two proposals during the discussion. What, therefore, would be the consequence to the enrolment strategy if the proposal to eliminate the fifteen-course degree were not approved?

Professor Sedra assured the member that the enrolment-expansion framework did not depend on the proposed elimination of the fifteen-credit degree in the Faculty of Arts and Science. The enrolment plan would retain its integrity with or without the Faculty's offering a fifteen-credit degree.

Another member suggested that the decision about the fifteen-credit degree would have an impact on enrolment strategy that the Committee might well wish to consider. For example, the elimination of the degree could reduce the ability of the University to recruit students, who might choose to study elsewhere where that degree was still available. Would it be appropriate to defer consideration of the proposed enrolment-growth framework until at least after the Committee's own consideration of the proposal to eliminate the fifteen-credit degree?

The Chair stated that if the proposal to eliminate the fifteen-credit degree were not approved, then any element of the proposed enrolment-expansion framework that depended on the fifteen-credit degree elimination would be null and void. He urged members to confine their discussion at this time to other aspects of the proposed framework.

A member commented that he was pleased that the proposal was not premised on the elimination of the fifteen-course degree. The matters were, however, interrelated, given that the elimination of the three-year degree would reduce the University's ability to contribute to increased accessibility - contrary to the effect of enrolment expansion.

A member cautioned that the proposal to eliminate the fifteen-course degree could imperil Government funding for enrolment expansion. The Government might well perceive that the University was not substantially increasing the number of university places by its enrolment expansion but merely increasing the number of course enrolments now required for all degrees in Arts and Science. The Government might well therefore decline to fund the expansion. Professor Sedra agreed that there was a risk of such a perception and that the member's point was a very important one. He thought, however, that any Government decision to change the funding formula in a manner that would penalize the University for its academic decisions would represent a very real intrusion on University autonomy, which any Government would be reluctant to commit.

**(k) Procedure for Committee consideration of this item.** In the course of discussion, a member voiced his concern about certain procedures for the Committee's consideration of the proposal. Documentation had been distributed late, giving members little opportunity to consider this important matter and to consult with colleagues. The detailed presentation of the item - supported by a power-point presentation - added virtually nothing to the information contained in the documentation. However, that presentation took away a great deal of the time available for the Committee's discussion. This was particularly worrisome in the member's case, given his need to leave almost immediately for another commitment.

A member commented that, notwithstanding concerns he had expressed, enrolment expansion was essential to increasing accessibility to higher education, and he supported the proposal.

6. **A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto** (cont'd)

Dean Amrhein stated that the Faculty of Arts and Science strongly supported the plan, which it regarded as an excellent one. Just as the University of Toronto favoured differentiation among Ontario's universities, so too the Faculty of Arts and Science favoured differentiation among campuses. The proposed framework document had been considered carefully within the Faculty. That had included a process of debate by the Deans and Chairs in the Faculty and discussion with the Principals on the St. George Campus and the University of Toronto at Mississauga. The Faculty hoped that one outcome would be to bring the two campuses within the Faculty closer together with a common view of the undergraduate curriculum. This had in fact already begun in the discussions leading to the Faculty's submission concerning enrolment expansion. The Faculty of Arts and Science supported the proposal fully, and Dean Amrhein hoped that the Province would fund the planned expansion.

In the course of discussion a member noted an error in item 10(a) - the name of the proposed joint program offered by the University of Toronto at Mississauga and Sheridan College of Applied Arts and Technology. The correct name was the program in Communication, Culture and Information Technology. It was AGREED that the correction be made in the document.

On the recommendation of the Vice-President and Provost,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the document titled *A Framework for Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto*, dated March 2000, be endorsed.

7. **Faculty of Arts and Science: Three-year (15-Credit) BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation**

The Chair stated that the Planning and Budget Committee was responsible for making recommendations with respect to the disestablishment of degree programs. Its role was to consider the planning and budget impact of the proposal on the various academic divisions on the three campuses and the University at large. The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, at its meeting of February 23, had considered the academic merits of the proposal. A copy of that Committee's Report had been distributed to members.

Professor McCammond said that the academic merits of the proposal to discontinue the 15-credit degrees had been discussed at length in the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and that Committee had supported the recommendation on its academic merits. That discussion was recorded in Report Number 78 of that Committee. The Planning and Budget Committee's consideration of the recommendation should also be decoupled from the question of the target enrolment in Arts and Science. Professor McCammond recalled that, to implement a decision to participate in the Access to Opportunities Program (involving an increase in enrolment in Computer Science), the Faculty of Arts and Science on the St. George Campus currently planned to increase its intake for 2000-01 by 160 students over its 1997-98 level. If the University decided to hold its intake constant after discontinuation of the 15-credit degrees, the total Arts and Science enrolment on all three campuses would increase by a total of 2,500 students. If the University decided instead to maintain its current total enrolment, then intake would have to be reduced.

Professor McCammond stated that the proposal would have no resource implications. With respect to the broader plan to increase enrolment, contained in the proposed *Framework*

**7. Faculty of Arts and Science: Three-year (15-Credit) BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation (cont'd)**

document any decision to increase enrolment would be implemented only if sufficient additional public funding was provided by the Government of Ontario. If that broader plan to increase enrolment were not to proceed, the Faculty of Arts and Science had provided assurances that it would nonetheless be able to offer solely 20-credit degree programs with no additional resources.

In response to a question for clarification of the resource implications, Professor McCammond and Dean Amrhein said that the University's plan to maintain the current intake level on the St. George Campus was based on the expectation that additional government funding would enable the expansion of total Arts and Science enrolment, involving the increase in fourth-year enrolment resulting from the elimination of the 15-credit degrees. If the Government did not provide increased funding, the outcome would be an increase in fourth-year enrolment along with a compensatory reduction in first-year intake in order to maintain the same overall enrolment. Dean Amrhein noted that not all Arts and Science students would return to complete a fourth year. As was currently the case, some students would begin programs in professional faculties such as Law or Medicine rather than complete their undergraduate degrees.

Principal McNutt said that the University of Toronto at Mississauga supported the proposal wholeheartedly on academic grounds. It did, however, have concerns about the financial consequences. A substantial proportion of students on the Mississauga campus currently graduated with 15-credit degrees. Some prospective students might still wish to work towards a 15-credit degree and might therefore decide to study elsewhere. Consequently, there might be need for a period of more than one year for the phasing out of the 15-credit degrees at Mississauga. It was AGREED TO AMEND the proposal so that it would become effective: for students first registering in the Faculty of Arts and Science on the St. George Campus in the academic year 2001-02, and for those first entering the Faculty on the Mississauga Campus at a time to be determined by the Vice-President and Provost and the Principal.

The Chair invited Ms Manon LePaven, President of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students, to speak to the proposal. Ms LePaven urged the Committee to defer its consideration of the matter until its meeting of May 9, 2000. In her view, it would be appropriate to take more time to think about this far-reaching change and particularly to consider its impact on part-time students, many of whom choose to pursue the 15-credit degree. Ms LePaven was confident that her organization would be able to bring forward an alternative proposal that the Committee would find meritorious of careful consideration. Importantly, before proceeding to eliminate the 15-credit degrees, the University should consider carefully barriers that prevented students, especially part-time students, from pursuing 20-credit degrees. Among other things, the current proposal contained no commitment to increase the number of courses to be made available during the summer session and no increase in financial support to part-time students. While it might well be desirable for students to earn a four-year degree, the fact was that many students simply could not afford to do so. A Task Force, chaired by Principal Hildyard of Woodsworth College, had been struck to consider such questions. Before proceeding with the decision to eliminate the 15-credit degrees, the Committee should receive the report of Professor Hildyard's Task Force and consider its adequacy. In addition, the University should, before proceeding, complete a survey of students. It should consider the implications for students who had already been awarded 15-credit degrees. Would the value of their degree be called into question by the University's ceasing to offer it? While there had been a great deal of comment on the international acceptability of the 15-credit degree, there had been no consideration of the Canadian acceptability of that degree held by alumni should the

7. **Faculty of Arts and Science: Three-year (15-Credit) BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation** (cont'd)

University cease to offer the degree. There was a great deal of uncertainty at this time. It was unclear whether the 15-credit degrees would still be offered by the University of Toronto at Scarborough and they would cease to be offered by the University of Toronto at Mississauga.

Dean Amrhein responded to Ms LePaven's comments. He stressed that the proposal would have no impact on alumni who currently held the 15-credit degree or on students currently registered in 15-credit degree programs. He noted that he had previously discussed the matter with Ms LePaven. The proposal had received very careful debate, involving all categories of students, within the Faculty of Arts and Science. The proposal had originated in the Faculty's Curriculum Renewal Committee, which included representatives of the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students and the Arts and Science Student Union. The Committee also included a graduate student (who was not a representative of the Graduate Students' Union). The proposal had then been debated on two occasions each by the Faculty's Chairs and by its General Committee. It had been supported by an overwhelming majority in all cases. The proposal had been clear and the process transparent. The Working Group chaired by Professor Hildyard was not intended to restrict its work to the question of accessibility for part-time students; rather it was to explore accessibility for all students. Dean Amrhein did not anticipate that the Working Group would be in a position to provide any new information for the Committee for its meeting of May 9.

Dean Amrhein stressed that it was important to understand the nature of part-time study in Arts and Science. Over 80% of students classified as part-time completed their degree programs in less than six years. Part-time students should not be seen exclusively or even largely as students who proceeded towards their degrees one course at a time, requiring a long time to complete their degrees.

Dean Amrhein also stressed that the Faculty was committed to maintaining its part-time enrolment for academic, curricular and scheduling reasons. In order to maintain overall enrolment, the absence of part-time students in upper year courses would require compensatory increases in enrolment in first- and second-year courses. A further increase in the size of those courses would be undesirable. Dean Amrhein could not, however, guarantee that the Faculty would be able to maintain the proportion of part-time student enrolment. The enrolment of part-time students had been declining across North America.

In the course of discussion, Professor Hildyard was invited to comment. She noted that part-time student enrolment had been declining throughout Canada since 1992 with the exception of two provinces: Alberta and British Columbia. British Columbia had also eliminated the 15-credit degree. It had, however, an arrangement for the transfer of credits from its colleges. Professor Hildyard thought it important that the University of Toronto look seriously at the issue of transfer credits.

Some members spoke against the proposal. One member stated his support for the proposal but nonetheless spoke of a number of serious "downside risks."

- It was inappropriate to argue that students who wished to pursue a three-year degree could enrol at other universities, including York University in the greater Toronto area. The finest university in the country should be accessible to all excellent students. A large proportion of part-time students pursued three-year degrees, and they brought with them to the University of Toronto the value of their life experiences.
- It would be inappropriate to eliminate the 15-credit degrees at this time, when the demand for university places was increasing because of demographic trends and when



7. **Faculty of Arts and Science: Three-year (15-Credit) BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation** (cont'd)

the Ontario system would face the pressure for places arising from the double cohort of students to graduate from secondary schools in and around 2003. The University of Toronto had a duty to make spaces available, and it should not have to limit its intake to compensate for the higher enrolment in fourth year.

- It was particularly wrong to eliminate the 15-credit degrees when it was uncertain that the Province would fund the University's plans to expand its enrolment. If the Province failed to do so, the University would actually have to reduce its intake, to compensate for higher fourth-year enrolment, at the very time it should be expanding its intake. If members did wish to support the proposal to eliminate the 15-credit degrees they should at the very least insist that its approval be made specifically conditional on the Province's providing funding for enrolment expansion. Even if one were to accept the academic arguments in favour of the elimination of the 15-credit degrees, those degrees should still be retained for students admitted for another three or four years until the double cohort had entered the system.
- There was risk that the Province would be unwilling to provide unrestricted funding for enrolment expansion if it perceived that such funding would be used in a manner that would not foster its goal of an increased number of places for incoming students. Rather the Government would extend the precedent it had adopted with such programs as the Access to Opportunities Program designed to increase enrolment in computer science, computer engineering and related fields, and it would provide funding tied to expansion of admission in certain areas. If that were to occur, the outcome of a decision to discontinue the 15-credit degree could be a reduction in university autonomy.
- It was generally wrong to make a radical change, removing from students the choice of pursuing a 15- or a 20-credit degree. While the proponents spoke of the 20-credit degree as being important to ensure that doors were opened to graduates anywhere, the elimination of the option to take a 15-credit degree in fact closed doors for the large proportion of students who had hitherto decided to earn that degree.
- The proposed change would reduce accessibility to the University for many students. Students who were forced to work their way through university or single mothers would not be able to undertake 20-credit programs. Such students would not only have to find the resources to pay for high tuition fees, other academic costs and living costs, but they would also have to pay the opportunity cost of another year's foregone earnings. While the University assumed that the needs of such students would be met by its financial aid programs, those programs saddled students with high levels of debt, and potential students who were economically disadvantaged would not be able to deal with such indebtedness.
- There was real financial risk faced by the University of Toronto at Mississauga. A high proportion of students at that campus graduated with 15-credit degrees. If the 15-credit degree was eliminated as an option, there was a risk that the campus might have difficulty in recruiting an adequate number of high-quality students. There was also a risk of difficulty in retaining students. Although students might initially plan to pursue a 20-credit degree, they might find that their plans change, and they would then transfer to another institution to complete a 15-credit degree. It would be very important for the University to recognize this risk to its enrolment and income and to make appropriate contingency plans.
- Proponents of the elimination of the 15-credit degree noted the precedent in British Columbia, where that change had apparently caused no harm to student accessibility or to University enrolment. The precedent should give no comfort because access in that Province was fostered by the much lower level of tuition fees.

7. **Faculty of Arts and Science: Three-year (15-Credit) BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation** (cont'd)

- There was no urgency to approving the proposal at this time. Delay would enable the closer examination of the issues. It would allow for a survey of potential students to determine whether they would apply to this University if they could not pursue a 15-credit degree. It would also enable the University to help to accommodate the once-only double cohort effect.
- It was inappropriate to argue, as some had done earlier in the debate, that the one-year reduction of Ontario secondary school programs made it necessary to add one year to the University's undergraduate Arts and Science programs. If such compensatory additions to the program were required, then the University would surely be proposing new content for its first-year courses. That would have very substantial resource implications. No changes, however, were being proposed.
- The elimination of the 15-credit degrees would be particularly unfortunate for students who wished to study in second-entry professional programs. If the University maintained that the elimination of the fifth year of secondary schooling required the addition of another year to undergraduate programs, then surely the professional faculties would require an additional year of preparation before they were willing to admit students. Moreover, many students entering professional faculties liked, and should have, the opportunity to complete a 15-credit degree before going on to their professional program.
- Advocates of the elimination of the 15-credit degrees argued that the change was necessary in order to ensure acceptability of the University's bachelor's degrees across North America, where other BA and BSc degrees were awarded after four years of full-time study or equivalent. However, the University should look beyond the North American context. Three years of study were required for an undergraduate degree in, for example, the United Kingdom. The University of Toronto should seek to assert its uniqueness and not surrender to North American homogenization. To do so would be to foster mediocrity.

Others spoke in favour of the proposal.

- The academic argument in favour of the elimination of the 15-credit degrees was overwhelming. The impossibility of students' obtaining the desirable depth and breadth in a 15-credit program forced difficult choices. The outcome of the proposed choice, however, would be the most compelling academic program in Canada.
- It would be unfair to offer a bachelor's degree to students that would not be recognized outside of Ontario.
- It was the University's duty to use its resources to make available an excellent academic degree to all students - not only full-time students. Elimination of the fifteen-course degree would ensure that the University made available the courses necessary for a 20-credit degree programs at times when they would be accessible to part-time students as well as full-time students. The Hildyard Task Force was seeking the means to achieve that objective.
- Times had changed, and the requirement for 20 credits for an Arts and Science degree was appropriate at the present time.
- The University did, on the best advice of the President, anticipate that its enrolment expansion would be funded. Therefore, it anticipated that it would be able both to require new students to complete four-year Arts and Science degree programs and to expand its first-year intake across the three campuses. Professor McCammond added that even if there were no additional public funding for enrolment expansion, the outcome of the elimination of the 15-credit degrees would be minor. There would need to be a reduction of about 1000 - 1500 students spread over three years, i.e. a decrease of about 300 - 500 students per year. That would be a small reduction relative

7. **Faculty of Arts and Science: Three-year (15-Credit) BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation** (cont'd)

to total intake, representing, for example, only about one third to one half of the Faculty's over-shoot of its intake enrolment target for 1999-2000. It was important to remember that the fundamental purpose of the proposal was not to reduce enrolment but to rebalance it.

- While it was clear that there would be need to provide additional student financial support to assist more students through the longer degree program, the University would find resources to provide that additional support.
- It was entirely appropriate to expect that students seeking 15-credit degrees could seek them elsewhere. There were seventeen universities in Ontario, including three in the Toronto area. The University of Toronto advocated role differentiation among universities, with each university providing programs in its distinctive areas of strength. Two of the three Toronto universities, as well as others in Ontario, would continue to offer a good 15-credit degree. The University of Toronto should also provide programs in its areas of strength by offering 20-credit programs which included high-level courses.
- Professor Sedra stated that no individual Arts and Science division would be at financial risk as a result of the proposed elimination of the 15-credit degrees. He made a firm commitment to provide financial support to any division(s) if this was needed to take into account any unfavourable enrolment experience that might arise from the elimination of the 15-credit degrees. Moreover, the amendment to the proposal gave the University of Toronto at Mississauga flexibility to eliminate the 15-credit degrees at a later date if that proved to be necessary for financial reasons. (Of course, the University of Toronto at Scarborough had yet to decide whether to eliminate its 15-credit degrees and, if so, when to do so.) Therefore, the risk was minimal to the University as a whole and to any of its divisions.
- With the inauguration of a strong three-semester system, students who wished to do so would still be able to complete their 20-credit degrees in three years by taking summer courses. If there was demonstrated need, financial aid would be available to help students to complete their 20-credit degrees in three years.
- It was irrelevant and distracting to make reference to the issue of the elimination of the fifth year of secondary school. Although that factor had been involved in the earliest discussions, it formed no part of the rationale for the proposal now before the Committee. It had not been the basis of discussions in the General Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Science or in the Governing Council's Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.
- The Faculty of Arts and Science had consulted with the University's professional faculties with respect to the proposed change, and none had regarded the proposal as being in any way problematic. While many of those professional faculties would consider admitting students with 15-credit degrees, the large majority of their admittees had in fact earned 20-credit degrees or even graduate degrees.
- The references to three-year degree programs in the United Kingdom were misleading. They followed the General Certificate of Education A-level preparation - probably a higher level of secondary school readiness. Degree programs in the United Kingdom also involved highly concentrated study in an area of specialization. More important, universities in the United Kingdom were facing substantial pressure to implement a four-year degree programs as their graduates were competing for positions within the European Union with four-year degree graduates from such countries as France and Germany.
- It was wrong to speak of the proposal as a move towards North American homogenization. The objective of the proposal was to ensure that this University's Arts and Science graduates would earn a credential that would be recognized anywhere.

7. **Faculty of Arts and Science: Three-year (15-Credit) BA/BSc Degrees: Discontinuation** (cont'd)

- The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had supported the proposal on its academic merits. The debate at today's meeting had revealed no planning or resource impediments. This Committee should therefore support the proposal.

In the course of discussion a member referred to Professor Hildyard's suggestion that the University of Toronto look seriously at the issue of transfer credits from colleges. The member proposed that the University also consider granting credits for work and life experience. Dean Amrhein replied that the issue was a difficult one. Professor Hildyard's Task Force would be confining itself to looking at the possibility of transfer credits for other learning experiences.

In the course of discussion, Professor Relph was invited to comment on discussions of the elimination of the 15-credit degrees at the University of Toronto at Scarborough. He reported that the matter was being discussed at the Scarborough Campus independently, as part of its curricular renewal and planning process.

On the recommendation of the Vice-President and Provost,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for the discontinuation of the three-year (15-credit) BA and BSc degrees, as described in the Faculty of Arts and Science submission, dated February 14, 2000, be approved, effective for students first registering in the Faculty of Arts and Science on the St. George Campus in the academic year 2001-2002 and at the University of Toronto at Mississauga at a time to be determined by the Vice-President and Provost and the Principal.

8. **Capital Project: Users' Committee Report – King's College Road/Circle Precinct**

The Chair stated that the Planning and Budget Committee was responsible for considering the reports of users' committees and, if appropriate, recommending their approval in principle to the Academic Board. Such recommendations took into account: the use of the proposed site, the space plan, the overall cost, the sources of funding, and any allocation of the University's own funds. Later in the process, the Business Board would be asked to consider this project, to approve the establishment of appropriations, and to authorize project execution within the approved cost. Because the cost of the proposed project was in excess of \$1 million, Governing Council approval would be required.

Professor McCammond said that there were three elements to the proposal. The first element was a recommendation for approval in principle of the Users' Committee report for the King's College precinct project - the first demonstration project for the open-space master plan. That report dealt with open space enhancements for: King's College Circle, Simcoe Walk (running west from King's College Circle to St. George Street, between Simcoe Hall and Knox College), King's College Road, Galbraith Road and the Plaza at Convocation Hall. The second element was a recommended allocation of \$200,000 from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for detailed designs and working drawings for the project. The third element was a recommended \$2.5-million allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for the King's College Road, Convocation Hall Plaza and Simcoe Walk components of the project. That allocation would be conditional on the University's raising \$1.5-million of funding for the project from private sources.

**8. Capital Project: Users' Committee Report – King's College Road/Circle Precinct**  
(cont'd)

A member said that he would have trouble supporting the recommendation for the proposed \$2.5-million allocation at a time when there were so many pressing alternative needs.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the proposal be divided to consider separately (a) the first two recommendations and (b) the recommendation of a \$2,500,000 allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for Phase 2 of the project.

The vote was taken on the motion.

The motion was defeated.

A member was sympathetic to the expression of concern about spending a large amount on landscape projects at a time of pressing alternative needs. Nonetheless, the University's experience with the St. George Street revitalization had demonstrated the value of such spending. That project had had an immediate and dramatic positive impact on the University's environment, for example around Sidney Smith Hall. There would always be competing needs for resources, but the proposal represented a prudent use of resources for a very good concept. Another member agreed. While he thought that higher priority should be given to achieving accessibility to all buildings, it was important to bring about changes that would improve the campus atmosphere for all students. The member hoped that a proposal on accessibility to buildings would be brought to the Committee at the next meeting.

A member referred to the proposed requirement for \$1.5-million of "private funding" as a condition for the \$2.5-million allocation from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund. He proposed that the condition be broadened to make the allocation conditional on "outside" funding of any kind. The amendment was accepted by the mover and seconder as being consistent with the intention of the original motion.

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

- (a) THAT the Report of the King's College Circle Precinct Users' Committee be approved in principle;
- (b) THAT \$200,000 immediately be allocated from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for Phase 1 of the project; and
- (c) THAT \$2,500,000 be allocated from the University Infrastructure Investment Fund for Phase 2 of the project when outside funding of \$1,500,000 is obtained.

**9. Woodsworth College: Academic Bridging Program – Establishment**

Professor McCammond referred to the Woodsworth College's proposal to replace its current Pre-University Program of non-credit preparatory courses with an Academic Bridging Program. That Program would make available to eligible students one of three academic bridging courses, offered jointly by the College and three of the academic departments in the Faculty of Arts and Science. Students who received the appropriate mark would be permitted to continue as degree students with degree credit for the bridging course. Professor McCammond

**9. Woodsworth College: Academic Bridging Program – Establishment** (cont'd)

stated that the change from the pre-University program to the academic bridging program would have no resource implications. The proposal was therefore brought to the Committee's attention only for information.

**10. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair said that the late Government announcement concerning operating grant funding and tuition fees was delaying the preparation of the University's budget. It would therefore be necessary to rearrange the Committee's meeting schedule for April and May. Members would be notified as soon as possible.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

April 10, 2000